Government

JUDICIAL DEPA

(R1)

FIDEN ENTIAL

}1912.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.(G.O. No. 1286, 14th August 1912.

Sedition.

Recording ling papers regarding the measures to be taken for the detection and suppression of ous conspi onspiracy and literature in the Travancore State.

, 14TH AUGUST 1912.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

UDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

---

garding the measures to be taken for the detection and suppressi... itious conspiracy and literature in the Travancore State.

---

o. 1286, Judicial, dated 14th August 1912.

Recorded.

(True Extract.)

A. G. CARDEW,
Ag. Chief Secretary.

CONFIDENTIAL.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 1286, JUDICIAL, DATED 14TH AUGUST 1912.

[SUBJECT.—*Sedition in the Travancore State.*]

Demi-official—from A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
To—the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.V.O., C.S.I., I.C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—Camp Courtallum, the 3rd August 1911.

With my "strictly confidential" demi-official, dated 31st July, despatched from Quilon, I sent you copy of a letter I had addressed to the Darbar protesting against the conduct of Mahadeva Aiyar, District Magistrate of Quilon, now on leave, who had so brow-beaten a witness who was alleged to have been ready to give useful information that the man fainted in Court.

My letter to the Darbar is dated 30th July and was based on a statement made by Sub-Inspector Kannan, of the Criminal Investigation Department, to the District Magistrate, Tinnevelly. On the afternoon of the 31st I saw Inspector Stevenage of the Travancore Police who was present in the verandah of the chattram while the witness (Subrahmaniyam) was being questioned by Mahadeva Aiyar. Stevenage said that when Subrahmaniyam found he was going to be taken before the District Magistrate he had already begun to waver and to pretend ignorance. When I asked him if he heard what went on inside, he said no. I asked him if he heard any words of abuse such as are attributed by the Criminal Investigation Department Sub-Inspector to Mahadeva Aiyar, and he again said no and added he thinks he would have heard them if they had been used. Shortly afterwards, he says, Subrahmaniyam came out supported between two men and sat down in the verandah in an exhausted condition. He said Subrahmaniyam was an obstinate man and several officials had been at him for some time but without success. I was not satisfied with Stevenage's version as he was palpably eager to minimise the fainting incident and to support his superiors in every way. I have since learnt that he wants to get a post as Market Inspector on his retirement which will be in a few days. He is very dependent therefore on the good word of his superior officers. As I had not received George's report about the incident which I asked for, I wired to George to come in and see me at Quilon on 1st August. His report had gone on to Trivandrum and back again, and I received it only on the 2nd August. He came in and told me that in this instance he does not for a moment believe that Mahadeva Aiyar tried to prevent Subrahmaniyam from speaking: on the other hand, Mahadeva Aiyar came to him and told him that Subrahmaniyam was obstinate and when he spoke harshly to him he had fallen down in a faint. George says that there was never any suggestion that Mahadeva Aiyar had *prevented* the man making a statement which he was willing to make; on the contrary, it was well known that Subrahmaniyam could say a good deal if he liked, but that all the efforts of the officials to make him speak had so far been unavailing although they had repeatedly assured him that he would not be made an accused. He thinks that Subrahmaniyam being pressed by his official superior—the chief official of the district—fainted through fright.

I place these fresh facts before you to know in what way Government consider they may be taken to affect the situation. I have pressed the Darbar to make a thorough enquiry into Mahadeva Aiyar's conduct in this matter. Shall it be left at that or, as I suggest, shall I write to the Darbar saying that, as it is known Mahadeva Aiyar is ill, the explanation which the Darbar will doubtless call for need not be sent till his leave expires* and pending its consideration I ask that he may be sent to another division?

A. T. FORBES.

* *Note.*—He had forty days' leave from 10th July.

Mahadeva Aiyar's previous conduct certainly raises a strong suspicion against him. On the other hand the Criminal Investigation Department Sub-Inspector's statement is silent as to what passed between Mahadeva Aiyar and Subrahmaniyam. He says he heard the District Magistrate utter the words "bastard son of an ass." And two minutes later Subrahmaniyam was carried senseless into the verandah while Mahadeva Aiyar went off to see George. Stevenage, neither a very intelligent nor a very reliable witness, says he was at the door and heard no such words. But supposing some abusive words were used, is it more probable they were used to make an unwilling witness speak or to shut the mouth of a man ready to speak? Judging by probabilities, it seems unlikely that a Brahman would act in that open and clumsy manner if he wished to impose silence

on a willing witness. And it is only the Sub-Inspector who represents Subrahmaniyam in that light, whereas we know from George that Subrahmaniyam was not a willing witness and he had obtained permission to bring him to Shencottah to see if he could be induced to speak when taken away from his own surroundings.

That the man was questioned—and harshly too according even to Mahadeva Aiyar's own admission to George—and that he fainted seem fairly well established: the question is whether Sub-Inspector Kannan has presented a true or a twisted view of the incident.

Previous papers at once please.

H. A. STUART—5-8-11.

Honourable Member (Judicial)—

H.E. the Governor—

With reference to this letter from Forbes, I invite attention to his letter of 3rd August placed below. It seems probable that the charges against Mahadeva Aiyar were not well founded. They were reported by Gillman, and I noted at the time that Gillman acted on hearsay and therefore in communicating them to Forbes I said that he was to make strong representations to the Darbar unless he found reason to believe that the charges were unfounded or exaggerated. (The papers are not available at the moment.)

Pages 21–22 of the notes to G.O. 1206, Judicial, 27th July 1911.

I think the Darbar may properly hold an enquiry into Mahadeva Aiyar's conduct, but this need not be held while he is ill.

H.A.S.—6-8-11.

I agree. Forbes can explain the matter as he explained it to us.

M. H[AMMICK]—6-8-11.

Demi-official—from A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
To—the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.V.O., C.S.I., I.C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—Camp Courtallum, the 4th August 1911.

With reference to my strictly confidential letter of the 3rd current, I enclose copies of a letter with enclosures which I received last night from the Acting Diwan and of my reply thereto. I request I may be informed by wire whether the preliminary enquiry may be deferred for another three weeks until Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar has sufficiently recovered to take part in it. He has had blood poisoning accompanied by profuse bleeding from the gums and discolouration in patches all over the body.

ENCLOSURES.

(1)

Demi-official—from the Acting Diwan of Travancore.
To—A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
Dated—the 2nd August 1911.

With reference to your strictly confidential note of the 30th ultimo, I beg to inform you that action will have to be taken against Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar under the rules regulating enquiries into the conduct of public servants passed by His Highness the Maharaja under date the 12th December 1896, published in page 284 of the Travancore English Almanac for 1898. A preliminary enquiry will have to be held in the first instance and in that enquiry a statement may also have to be taken from Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar. If from the preliminary enquiry it appears that there are sufficient grounds for holding a formal and public enquiry, a report will have to be submitted to His Highness and a Commission appointed by His Highness to hold the enquiry. On my way back from Shencottah I paid a visit to Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar but found him so weak and poorly that I did not think it advisable even to ask him to extend his leave. I was afraid that my advice might give rise to surmises and conjectures and interfere with his convalescence. I therefore thought it proper to write and ask Dr. Lakshmanan, who has been treating Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar, about his state of health, and copies of my note as well as of his reply I enclose for your information. Though reluctant to put off the enquiry asked for by you, I fear that the starting of the enquiry now may prove dangerous to Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar's health in his present condition. Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar will be in fit condition according to Dr. Lakshmanan in about three weeks' time. May I therefore request you to kindly let me know whether, under the circumstances, the preliminary enquiry may not be deferred for three weeks? Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar's leave expires by the 19th instant.

Sub-Enclosure (i).

Demi-official—from the Acting Diwan of Travancore.
To—Dr. PETER N. LAKSHMANAN.
Dated—the 1st August 1911.

Kindly let me know what Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar's present state of health is, and favour me with your opinion as to whether he is just now in a fit condition to take part in any official enquiry or submit any official explanation without endangering his health and, if not, when he will be in a fit condition for the purpose.

Sub-Enclosure (ii).

Demi-official—from Dr. PETER N. LAKSHMANAN.
To—the Acting Diwan of Travancore.
Dated—the 1st August 1911.

Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar has practically recovered from the illness he was suffering from recently but is still in a convalescent state and weak.

I have strictly enjoined him to take complete rest and continue appropriate treatment and diet and, if he could manage it, to go out for a change as well to enable him to recover his strength.

In the interest of his health I am of opinion that it is best he took part in no official work or inquiry for at least three weeks more unless other complications, unforeseen now, followed necessitating a longer absence.

The longer the period of rest and change for him the better.

(2)

Demi-official—from A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
To—the Acting Diwan of Travancore.
Dated—the 4th August 1911.

In reply to your confidential letter of the 2nd current, I write to say that I have informed my Government of Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar's state of health and of your suggestion that the preliminary enquiry may be deferred for another three weeks, until he is sufficiently recovered to take part in it. Meanwhile I agree that enquiry may be postponed for the present.

Put up with papers circulated yesterday.

H.A.S.—7-8-11.

Under His Excellency's personal instructions the annexed telegram should issue at once and the demi-official by to-morrow's post. A demi-official received to-day is referred to in the draft telegram. That demi-official should be added to this file.

H.A.S.—7-8-11.

Telegram—from the Chief Secretary to Government.
To—the Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
Dated—Ootacamund, the 8th August 1911.

Your letters of 3rd and 4th. Government have no objection to [the] postponement of inquiry.

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.V.O., C.S.I., I.C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
To—A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
Dated—Ootacamund, the 9th August 1911.

I have just sent you a telegram saying that the Government have no objection to the postponement of the inquiry into Mahadeva Aiyar's conduct. I am desired to suggest that, in view of the doubt that has arisen regarding the truth of the charge brought against him, it would be well to take some means of modifying the terms of the representation made in your demi-official to the Diwan, dated 30th July 1911. You might explain matters to the Diwan as you have explained them to the Government.

***Under Secretary*—**

Submitted to the Under Secretary for perusal.

T.V.T.—11-8-11.

Seen. The demi-official of the 31st July should be added to the confidential reports (kept by the General Utility Superintendent?) and a note should be made of the fact for the purposes of this file.

S. H. SLATER—12-8-11.

Demi-official—from A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
To—the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.V.O., C.S.I., I.C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—Trivandrum, the 22nd August 1911.

I have seen Mr. Rajagopalachari this morning and received from him typed copies of the statements made by Subrahmaniya Aiyar and by Nagam Pillai, the Tahsildar-Magistrate at Punalur at the period to which those statements relate. The Diwan has also forwarded Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar's own version of the incident. He was careful to state that it was not asked for in explanation of an allegation made against Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar which he was required to meet but for the information of the Diwan regarding an incident which had come to his notice and about which he wanted to get at the facts.

That Subrahmaniya Aiyar is a scoundrel there can be no doubt: his statement, especially the early part of it, shows that even to the Diwan he was fencing with the questions put to him but, shifty as he is, he makes it clear that what Mahadeva Aiyar did was to press him to speak out what he knew.

Nagam Pillai's statement is that he was in the verandah and heard Mahadeva Aiyar scolding Subrahmaniya Aiyar. He could not hear what was said, but presently Mahadeva Aiyar called him in and said the man was shamming fainting and asked him to lead him out and he did so. At Mahadeva Aiyar's direction he took his statement after Subrahmaniya Aiyar had lain down for a few minutes. The statement is a long one and is set out *in extenso* in Nagam Pillai's evidence.

Nagam Pillai says he read out this statement to Mahadeva Aiyar, who then directed him to take down the statements of some other persons also. He did so and the next day he took them along with Subrahmaniya Aiyar to Mr. George who examined them in his presence when they—including presumably Subrahmaniya Aiyar—repeated their statements of the previous day.

Mr. George is at Tinnevelly and the Diwan will question him on his return. I will then send up all the statements taken with my final remarks.

The second part of Mahadeva Aiyar's letter contains the explanation which he was called upon to furnish for not having placed on record or taken action on a report regarding the dissemination of seditious literature.

This may await the further report which the Resident promises.

H.A.S.—26-8-11.

Demi-official—from A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
To—the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.V.O., C.S.I., I.C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—Trivandrum, the 28th August 1911.

In my confidential demi-official of the 22nd I said I would forward the statements of the witnesses examined by the Diwan as soon as George, who was then at Tinnevelly, had been questioned.

I now forward (*a*) the statement of Subrahmaniya Aiyar, (*b*) the statement of Nagam Pillai, (*c*) Mahadeva Aiyar's letter to the Diwan containing his version of the brow-beating incident, (*d*) and (*e*) George's letters to the Diwan, after looking up his notes, on the subject of his examination of Subrahmaniya Aiyar and the date he first heard about the dissemination of seditious pamphlet.

The enclosures (*d*) and (*e*) were received by me only to-day and as it is a holiday I have not been able to get copies made. I accordingly forward the copies sent by the Diwan and request that when you have done with them you will return them to me to complete my file.

From George's letter (*d*) it will be seen that he saw Subrahmaniya Aiyar on 2nd July and with difficulty extracted a limited amount of information from him and noted against him "an absolute villain in my opinion" and that on the morning of the 4th he again saw him when he was brought by Nagam Pillai and he then made a much more detailed statement. George's letter thus corroborates Nagam Pillai's statement. At the same time it shows that Subrahmaniya Aiyar was a reluctant witness and that he was still untruthful when he was questioned by the Diwan for on this latter occasion Subrahmaniya Aiyar had the effrontery to say that when he had been examined by the Superintendent on the day previous to the date of the alleged brow-beating he had told Mr. George "all the facts which I subsequently related to Mr. Nagam Pillai."

George's letter also makes it clear that Mahadeva Aiyar himself told him of the "fainting" incident either on the same day or the next and he attached no significance to it.

I have no doubt, therefore, that so far as this charge—or rather allegation—is concerned, Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar must be exonerated of any intention or attempt to shut the mouth of a witness willing to give information.

As regards the other matter, viz., dissemination of seditious pamphlets, it is impossible to acquit Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar of great carelessness—to say the least—in keeping back the report. From paragraph (4) of his letter it would appear that he is sheltering himself behind the plea that Police Inspector Kumara Pillai was present when he got the report and as "he seemed to know what was going on" and was also going to see Mr. George, he thought he would give him full information. But the Inspector apparently did not know and it is certain that Mr. George only heard of it several days later. Moreover, that report contained much information about various other important matters which should have been imparted as early as possible to Mr. George. However, the Diwan is enquiring further into this matter and, as it is not directly connected with the Subrahmaniya Aiyar incident which evoked my letter to the Darbar asking for an enquiry, I think the two subjects may be kept separate.

If Government is satisfied with the evidence now forwarded regarding the Subrahmaniya Aiyar incident, I suggest that I should intimate to the Darbar in a confidential letter that I have reported to my Government that the statements taken show that the interpretation placed on Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar's conduct was a mistaken one and that Government accept his version of the incident.

Under Secretary—

Submitted for orders with reference to the Chief Secretary's note on the demi-official, dated the 22nd August.

T.V.T.—4-9-11.

Chief Secretary—

S.H.S.—4-9-11.

Hon'ble Sir Murray Hammick—

H.E. the Governor—

Mr. Forbes may take the action suggested at the end of his letter. There is not any evidence of value that Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar tried to bully Subrahmaniya Aiyar into holding his tongue. The Criminal Investigation Department Sub-Inspector jumped to that conclusion because Subrahmaniya Aiyar evidently did not tell all he knew. It is to be hoped he will be dismissed.

No evidence at all.
M. H[AMMICK]—8-9-11.
None.
A. L[AWLEY]—10-9-11.

2. Mr. Forbes may be asked to ascertain what steps the Darbar is taking to prevent and detect seditious plots in Travancore. We can't say much about the past for our own arrangements were seriously defective.

H.A.S.—6-9-11.

I agree.
M. H[AMMICK]—8-9-11.
Yes.
A. L[AWLEY]—10-9-11.

M. H[AMMICK]—8-9-11.

A. L[AWLEY]—10-9-11.

Under Secretary—

Draft demi-official to Mr. Forbes submitted.

T.V.T.—12-9-11.

Chief Secretary—

S.H.S.—12-9-11.

Issue.

H.A.S.—12-9-11.

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.V.O., C.S.I., I.C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
To—A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
Dated—Ootacamund, the 14th September 1911.
No.—4047-1, Judicial.

With reference to your demi-official, dated the 28th August 1911, I am desired to inform you that, after perusing the papers, the Government are satisfied that the interpretation put upon Mahadeva Aiyar's conduct was mistaken and that you may accordingly take the action suggested at the end of your letter.

2. I am at the same time to ask you to ascertain and report to Government what steps the Darbar is taking to prevent and detect seditious plots in Travancore.

Demi-official—from A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
To—the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.V.O., C.S.I., I.C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—Trivandrum, the 11th November 1911.
No.—50-1 (Confdl.).

With reference to your confidential demi-official No. 4047-1, dated 14th September 1911, I write to inform you that the Darbar fully realises the serious gravity of the matter and states that effective action will soon be taken to prevent a recurrence of the incidents referred to. The Darbar, however, feels that it would be well to await the disposal of the cases pending before the Madras High Court so that it may deal with the situation in the light of the evidence adduced and the findings thereon of the Madras High Court. The Darbar enquires whether there is any objection to a little delay in the matter. In the meantime the Darbar has asked Mr. George, the Superintendent of Police, to submit a full report on the incidents in Travancore so far as they have come within his knowledge during his investigation. This is necessary in the opinion of the Darbar, as all the evidence obtained by Mr. George does not appear to have been put in before the Indian courts. A special reporter has also been engaged to take down the whole evidence given in the High Court which is being printed. The Darbar has promised to send me a copy of the printed evidence soon after the case is over. I think that in the circumstances the Darbar's request that it may defer setting out detailed proposals till the evidence is before it in convenient form is reasonable and may be approved.

Under Secretary—

Submitted for orders as to the reply.

T.V.T.—15-11-11.

Chief Secretary—

Mr. Forbes' proposal at the end of his letter may be approved. Mr. Napier told me the other day that the case in the High Court would probably go on until after the Christmas holidays.

C. A. SOUTER—16-11-11.

Yes.

H.A.S.—16-11-11.

Under Secretary—

Draft demi-official to Mr. Forbes submitted.

T.V.T.—18-11-11.

Issue.

C.A.S.—18-11-11.

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.V.O., C.S.I., I.C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
To—A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
Dated—Fort St. George, the 18th November 1911.
No. 4047-2, Judicial.

With reference to your demi-official No. 50-1 (Confdl.), dated the 11th instant, I am desired to inform you that the Government have no objection to the Darbar deferring action as proposed.

Demi-official—from R. A. GRAHAM, Esq., I.C.S., Acting Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
To—the Hon'ble Mr. A. G. CARDEW, C.S.I., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—Camp Mattupatti, the 24th May 1912.
No.—50-11 (Confdl.).

I enclose a copy of a letter I have received from the Diwan of Travancore on the subject of the measures to be taken to detect and prevent seditious conspiracies in future.

2. The Diwan first asks that there shall be a more full and free communication between the British and Travancore Police in future than there has been in the past in regard to the movements of suspicious persons and to the existence of seditious movements likely to spread from British territory into Travancore. I believe it has not been customary in the past for the Criminal Investigation Department to communicate with the Superintendent of Police in Travancore; but under present circumstances there seems no reason why this should not be done.

3. He goes on to suggest that special enquiries should be undertaken from time to time by members of the police force (apparently) deputed for the purpose as to the feeling of the public in political matters, especially how they feel towards the British Government; to promise that a careful watch shall be kept on the accused acquitted in the recent conspiracy trial, and also on the convicted accused after their release from imprisonment; to state that if any officer can be singled out for special commendation in connection with the enquiries made after the murder of Mr. Ashe, such officer will be suitably rewarded, so that all officers in the service of the Darbar may know what importance is attached to effective action on such occasions; and finally to ask for any further advice which Government may wish to give.

4. As you know, these are more or less the suggestions which I made to the Diwan. I did not mean, however, that some particular officer who had done good work should be given some specific reward; but rather that those who had been found to have helped materially in the unravelling of the conspiracy should all be regarded with some special favour; and I have communicated to the Diwan the Government's opinion that the Darbar might also make it plain that those who are known to have been apathetic in the matter or have shown any sympathy with criminal conspiracies or conspirators must expect no official favour or advancement. I think also it should be impressed on all officials that it is their duty to report at once the existence of any societies of a seditious or objectionable tendency or the importation or propagation of obnoxious literature, and that serious notice should be taken of any failure in this respect. The scope of the proposed periodical enquiries should also be enlarged to cover these matters; and particular care will have to be taken in the selection of the persons entrusted with those enquiries. The Travancore Police is not noted either for capacity or for energy, and Mr. George has considerable difficulty, I believe, in ordinary enquiries, which will be enhanced in respect of enquiries into the actions and tendencies of persons in higher social positions than common criminals. The enquiries and the selection should, as far as possible, be left in his hands or should at least be made in consultation with him in order that there may be no interference with his authority over his subordinates. Beyond this, I have no suggestions to make.

ENCLOSURE.

Demi-official—from the Diwan of Travancore.
To—the Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
Dated—the 25th April 1912.

I write to reply to Mr. Forbes' demi-official to me, dated 17th September 1911, enquiring, with reference to the facts disclosed during the investigation into the murder of Mr. Ashe, what action the Darbar had taken or proposed to take for the detection of seditious plots in the State. As already stated by me in my letter to Mr. Forbes, dated 1st November 1911, the Darbar fully realises the importance of the matter and is prepared to take such action as would prevent a recurrence of the incidents brought to light.

2. The Darbar has now had the opportunity of perusing the judgments of the Madras High Court in Special Bench Case No. 1 of 1911. Of the fourteen accused charged in that case, Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 14 belong to Travancore; and of these all except Nos. 8 and 9 are natives of Shencottah. No. 8 belongs to Punalur and so also No. 9. All the Travancore accused (along with the other accused) have been acquitted of the abetment, by conspiracy, of Mr. Ashe's murder, but four of the Travancore accused, namely, Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 14, have been convicted of conspiracy within section 121-A of the Penal Code. The Special Bench find that the conspiracy had its inception early in April 1910, with the advent of the 1st accused Nilakanta at Tenkāsi, where a meeting was held on the 10th April, at which an oath was taken for the purpose of a general rising to drive out the British from the country. Admittedly no Travancoreans were present at this meeting. Later on, Nilakanta visited Cochin, Alleppey and Quilon, but there is no evidence as to how he occupied his time during this visit. The second meeting was held at Tuticorin, about the middle of July, at which meeting also an oath was taken, as at the first meeting, but here again there were no Travancoreans present. The third meeting was at Punalur, and it was attended by the 6th, 7th and 8th accused, but no sedition was talked. Then two meetings were held at Shencottah, the fourth and fifth

meetings which were attended by the 6th, 11th and 14th accused, the assassin Vanchi Aiyar and the deceased Dharmaraja Aiyar, but it does not appear that any oath was taken at these meetings; but the 1st accused Nilakanta harangued the others on the miserable economic condition of India and wound up with the pressing necessity of exterminating the English. The sixth meeting was held at Punalur, where oath was taken by, among others, the assassin Vanchi, the deceased Dharmaraja and the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th and 14th accused. It also appears from the judgment of the High Court (I am speaking of the judgment of the majority of the Judges) that before the advent of the first accused Nilakanta, there was a secret society at Shencottah, called the Bharatha Mata Association, of which the assassin Vanchi, the deceased Dharmaraja and the accused Nos. 6, 7 and 14 were members; but though the society was clearly of a seditious tendency, its object being to procure, read and discuss papers from Pondicherry, its members as such did not bring themselves in any way within the reach of the law. The actual murder of Mr. Ashe appears to have been resolved upon at Ottappidāram, according to the prosecution 12th witness, at the house of one Madasami; the only Travancorean then present was the assassin Vanchi Aiyar. About April or May 1911 there were two further meetings held at Shencottah, in the houses of the 11th and 12th accused, which were attended by the 6th, 7th, 8th and 14th accused, the assassin Vanchi and the deceased Dharmaraja Aiyar. At these two meetings the assassin Vanchi took the lead (Nilakanta not being present) and expatiated upon the necessity of developing the resources of the country and driving out the English. The Judges have recorded the opinion that every person who attended *and took the blood oath* was guilty of joining in a conspiracy punishable under section 121-A of the Penal Code. So far as the evidence let in before the Special Tribunal goes, only *one* of the *three* oath meetings was held in Travancore territory, the other two being held in British territory. My object in mentioning this specifically is not by any means to minimise the seriousness of the thing so far as Travancore is concerned, but to point out that, if the executive officers of Travancore were out of touch with what was going on, the blame can hardly be laid more upon them than on the executive officers of the adjoining British district. The fact seems to be that no body had any idea, either in the Tinnevelly district or in the Shencottah and Punalur taluks of the Travancore State, that a thing like this was brewing. It is now clear that the murder of Mr. Ashe itself was not contemplated by the conspirators as a body. It was the individual act of a member of the organisation who happened to be a Travancorean and whose passion must have been inflamed by the seditious literature he had been reading and by the malign influence exercised over him from Pondicherry and Ottappidāram.

3. The chief thing that I would suggest for preventing a recurrence of seditious plots like these is that there should be full and free exchange of information (in regard to matters like these) between the British and Travancore Police. It does not appear to have been so in the past. In the present case, as already stated, the conspiracy began in British territory; it then extended into the two taluks of Travancore adjoining the British district of Tinnevelly; in both these taluks, Shencottah specially, there were men related to the disaffected classes in British India and sympathising with them. If any intimation or warning had been given to the Travancore Police that a criminal movement like this had originated in British territory and was likely to spread into Travancore, of course a rigorous watch would have been kept. As it was, the one thing which the Travancore Executive was not prepared for was that any portion of Travancore territory would be used as a base for seditious action against the Paramount Power. Also I would point out that the 1st accused Nilakanta, who is found to have organised the whole thing, was a man of Tanjore district; his last employment was an editor of a vernacular paper published at Pondicherry, which was proscribed by the Madras Government in March 1910. This man came to Tenkāsi, where he started his organisation; and he later on came into Travancore territory. He spent his time (about five months) between Tenkāsi, Tuticorin, Courtallum, Shencottah, Punalur and Alleppey. A man like that was presumably being watched by the Criminal Investigation Department. If so, I submit that intimation of his having entered Travancore territory should have been conveyed to the Travancore Police. The first thing therefore that I would suggest is that arrangements should be made for greater co-ordination between the British and Travancore Police than is visible in this case. Without such co-ordination, all other precautions that may be taken would be comparatively futile. The Darbar of course recognises the obligation lying on it to watch all suspects coming from British territory, but I submit that this obligation cannot be satisfactorily discharged unless the movement of these suspects from British into Travancore territory is notified systematically to the executive officers of the Darbar.

4. Another point which I have considered carefully is whether an organisation corresponding to the British Criminal Investigation Department may not be started in Travancore. I feel that the idea is not practical. Travancore is after all not very much more in size than an average Madras district; and in population it is not more than, say, two Madras districts. I hardly think that this area or population would justify the creation of *two* agencies for police work, a normal and a special one. The chances are that there would be friction between the two agencies and any advantage we may have by having a confidential branch to deal with matters like these will be nullified by the circumstance that the men in the Secret Branch will very soon become known to the people among whom they work. I would therefore deprecate the organisation of a special or secret branch of the police. At the same time, after what has taken place,

it is necessary to make enquiries from time to time, especially in the border taluks, as to the feeling of the public in political matters, especially how they feel towards the British Government. This can be done through the existing police force by deputing from time to time a special man for the purpose of making a careful enquiry in the matter.

5. The 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th accused are the four Travancoreans who have been acquitted by the High Court. These will of course be watched. And so also the convicted Travancoreans, namely, the 6th, 7th, 8th and 14th accused, when they return after serving their terms of punishment.

6. In regard to the investigation conducted by the British Police *after* the incident, I have no hesitation in repeating to you that I have already said to Mr. Forbes that the officers of Travancore have been doing all that they could to co-operate with the British police; the circumstance that the trial has ended in the conviction of so many as nine accused, of whom four are Travancoreans, may be taken to be a proof of my statement. Mr. George has sent me a report on the whole case, and I gather generally from that report that he and his men did all that was possible by way of co-operating with and helping their brethren over the frontier. I am also looking over the file of correspondence to see if any of the Darbar officers did *particularly* good work in this direction, and, if I find that any officer could be singled out for *special* commendation and preferment, I shall see that he is suitably rewarded, so that all officers in the service of the Darbar may know what importance is attached to effective action on occasions like these.

7. In conclusion, I feel that this communication is not as precise as I would wish. You may rest assured of the Darbar's anxiety to prevent the occurrence of plots like these and of its readiness to take such steps as may be necessary for the purpose. The difficulty, however, is to say what exactly could be done beyond what of course it is our obvious duty to do. The Darbar will deem it a favour if the Madras Government will give the matter their consideration and give the Darbar their advice which, I need hardly assure you, will be gladly acted upon.

Under Secretary—

The Resident's demi-official is submitted for orders.

2. The demi-official is apparently intended as a reply to this Government's demi-official No. 4047–1, Judicial, dated 14th September 1911, enquiring, what action the Darbar proposes to take to detect and prevent seditious plots in Travancore.

3. For orders as to whether the views of the Inspector-General of Police may be invited on these proposals u.o. He will no doubt consult the Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Criminal Investigation Department and Railways.

T.V.T.—7-6-12.

Chief Secretary—

I think the file may [illegible]nt u.o. to the Inspector-General of Police for his opinion.

L. J. P. JOLLY—7-6-12.

Under Secretary—

Please see demi-official C. No. 89, Political, dated 1st May 1912, in Stolmenberg file in sealed cover.

V.S.M.—10-6-12.

I had not seen this correspondence before, but a demi-official was sent to the Resident about a month ago on the subject of the Darbar's attitude towards loyal and disloyal Government officials. Please put that up. It was issued in Political.

A. G. CARDEW—8-6-12.

Chief Secretary—

L.J.P.J.—10-6-12.

I want to know whether the various Criminal Investigation Department periodical reports are sent (1) to the Resident or Political Agent, (2) the Darbar of any Native State.

A.G.C.—11-6-12.

Under Secretary—

The Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Criminal Investigation Department and Railways, may be requested u.o. to kindly furnish the particulars wanted by the Chief Secretary as they are not easily traceable in the office and as the Superintendent, Government Press, knows only about the distribution of confidential newspaper reports.

T.V.T.—17-6-12.

Send u.o. to the Deputy Inspector-General.

L.J.P.J.—18-6-12.

CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION DEPARTMENT.

The Special Branch publish (1) and (2): the Criminal Investigation Department (3):—

(1) Secret Abstract.
(2) Weekly Newspaper Report.
(3) Criminal Intelligence Gazette.

2. The *Secret Abstract* is sent to—

(1) Resident in Hyderabad.
(2) Resident in Mysore.
(3) Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
(4) Inspector-General of Police, Ceylon.

It is *not* sent to any Darbars.

3. The *Weekly Newspaper Report* is sent to—

(1) Resident in Mysore.
(2) Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana.
(3) Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General in Central India.
(4) Resident in Hyderabad.
(5) Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
(6) Resident in Nepal.

It is *not* sent to any Darbars.

4. The *Criminal Intelligence Gazette* is distributed to Residents, Agents and Darbars as shown in the accompanying two lists.

C. LONGDEN—21-6-12.

ENCLOSURES.

(1)

List of Residents or Political Agents to whom copies of the "Madras Criminal Intelligence Gazette", published by the Criminal Investigation Department, Madras, are sent.

Designation of the officer.	Station.
List of Residents.	
1. The Resident in Mysore	Bangalore.
2. The Resident in Travancore	Trivandrum.
3. The District Magistrate, Mercara	Coorg.
List of Poli[illegible] be se[illegible]	
1. The Assistant to the Agent to the Gover[illegible] General of India, Central India Agency.	[illegible]
2. His Majesty's Consul at Pondicherry	[illegible]cherry.
3. The Superintendent-General of Police, Mount Abu.	Rajputana.

(2)

List of Darbars to whom copies of the "Madras Criminal Intelligence Gazette", published by the Criminal Investigation Department, Madras, are sent.

Designation of the officer.	Name of the State.
1. Inspector-General of Police, Gwalior, Central India.	Gwalior.
2. Inspector-General of Police, Indore	Indore.
3. Do. Marwar	Marwar.
4. Do. Jind	Phulkian States and Bhawalpur.
5. The City Magistrate	Jaipur.
6. The Superintendent of Gerai	Jaipur.
7. The Commissioner of Police, Baroda	Baroda.
8. The Superintendent of Police	Ajmere.
9. Do. Travancore ...	Travancore.
10. Do. Jalandur Division.	Maler-Katla.
11. Do. Lahore Division ...	Chamba.
12. Do.	Bhawalpur.
13. Do.	Bundi.
14. The Superintendent of Police and Gerai	Kishengar (Rajputana).
15. The Superintendent-General of State Police, Bikaneer, Rajputana.	Bikaneer.

List of Darbars to whom copies of the "Madras Criminal Intelligence Gazette", published by the Criminal Investigation Department, Madras, are sent—cont.

Designation of the officer.	Name of the State.
16. The Superintendent of State Police	Bharatpur.
17. The Assistant Superintendent of Police, Delhi Division (Nahan State).	Sirmur.
18. The Kotwal in charge of Tonk Police Force, Rajputana.	Tonk.
19. The Inspector-General of Police, Mysore	Mysore.
20. The Pudukkōttai Darbar	Pudukkōttai.
21. The Mahakamaikas Chief Council, Mewar, Rajputana.	Mewar.
22. The Inspector-General of Police, Jalandur Division.	Kapurthala.
23. The Inspector-General of Police and Jails ...	Hyderabad (Deccan).
24. The Assistant Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department.	Do.
25. The Deputy Inspector-General of Police in charge of His Highness the Nizam's State Railway Police.	Secunderabad (Hyderabad State).
26. The Inspector of Police, Jalundur Division ...	Faridkote.
27. The Superintendent of Police	Cochin State.
28. Do.	Alwar.
29. The Diwan	Kotah.
30. Do.	Jhalwar.
31. Do.	Sakti (Central Provinces).
32. The Feudatory Chief	Kankar (Central Provinces).
33. Do.	Khariagarh (Central Provinces).
34. Do.	Raigarh (Central Provinces).
35. Do.	Patna, Bolangir (Central Provinces).
36. Do.	Bamra (Central Provinces).
37. Do.	Rampur, Rehrakhol (Central Provinces).
38. Do.	Makrai (Central Provinces).
39. The Maharaja and Feudatory Chief	Sonpur Feudatory State.
40. The Superintendent	Bastar, Jagadalpur.
41. Do.	Nandgaon State.
42. Do.	Chhuikhadan (Central Provinces).
43. Do.	Kawardha.
44. Do.	Sarangarh.
45. Do.	Kalahandi.
46. The Superintendent of Police	Shapura (Rajputana).
47. The Mekhmakas	Dungarpur (Do.).
48. Do.	Partabgar (Do.).
49. Do.	Banswara (Do.).

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

Under Secretary—

With reference to the Chief Secretary's query on page 9 *ante* the Criminal Investigation Department note is submitted for perusal.

T.V.T.—25-6-12.

Chief Secretary—

L.J.P.J.—25-6-12.

Honourable Member—

H.E. the Governor—

Please see notes on page 5 to which the Resident's letter, dated 24th May 1912, on page 7 relates.

2. The most important suggestion made by the Diwan of Travancore is that there should be "full and free exchange of information between the British and Travancore "police," and that arrangements should be made for greater co-ordination between the two than has hitherto been the case. It appears from the Criminal Investigation Department report, dated 21st June 1912, that the Secret Abstract is sent to the Resident

in Travancore and Cochin, but not to the Darbar. It is, I think, undesirable to send it to the Darbar. But I think that it might be sent demi-officially to the Travancore Superintendent of Police direct, as a personal matter and so long as Mr. George is there, for perusal *and return*. The communication should not become a regular routine and should be done each week under the orders of the Deputy Inspector-General. The Inspector-General might be asked whether he can suggest any further measures of co-ordination between the British and State police.

3. The Diwan's second suggestion that an officer might be deputed from time to time to make special enquiries "as to the feeling of the public in political matters" may be approved, though the proposed object of enquiry does not seem likely to be very fruitful of results.

4. Mr. Graham's suggestion that it should be impressed upon all officials that it is their duty to report the existence of seditious societies or literature should, I think, also be given effect to.

A.G.C.—26-6-12.

I agree that Mr. George should be kept informed of all political matters that do or may concern Travancore, but it would be better to send him special notes of such information rather than to send him a copy of the abstract which contains a good deal of information that in no way concerns Travancore. If we once begin sending the whole abstract to the Travancore Superintendent, it will be difficult to stop it.

I agree.
M. H[ammick]—29-6-12.

2. I do not approve of the Diwan's proposal to make periodical inquiries regarding the political feeling in the districts of Travancore which border on British India. Such enquiries are not likely to do much good and may do a great deal of harm. The special officer would be unable to keep his inquiries secret and he might arouse the very feeling which we hope will disappear. Moreover, there would be a tendency on his part to prove his zeal by collecting a lot of information of very doubtful value. What is wanted is a continuous alertness on the subject and the superior officers of the Travancore police may be instructed as suggested by Mr. Graham and approved in paragraph 4 of the Chief Secretary's note.

I agree.
M. H[ammick]—29 6-12.

3. The Criminal Investigation Department may be asked whether they wish to bring to notice any services of value rendered by the Travancore police.

I agree.
M. H[ammick]—29-6-12.

H. A. S[tuart]—28-6-12.

I agree to the above. I suppose the Resident in Travancore sees the Travancore Inspector-General of Police from time to time and he could by word of mouth give him any intelligence he gets from the Criminal Investigation Department reports. It would not of course do for the Resident to be in regular communication with the Inspector-General, but a good Resident could always manage to let the Inspector-General know anything of importance.

I don't think the Inspector-General, Travancore, should get the Criminal Investigation Department abstracts, but the Inspector-General, Madras, could always arrange to let him know of anything of interest and importance which related to Travancore.

M. H[ammick]—29-6-12.

Chief Secretary—

I doubt whether the opinions of Government should be formulated in a Government Order; it will, I think, suffice to communicate them to the Resident by demi-official.

L.J.P.J.—4-7-12.

Yes; the demi-official form should certainly be used.

A.G.C.—4-7-12.

Under Secretary—

A draft demi-official to the Resident is submitted for approval. It is presumed that there will be a formal official communication from the Resident later on regarding the measures to be adopted. In any case it seems necessary, after the issue of the demi-official, to send the file u o. to the Inspector-General of Police in order that he may know what is expected of him and that he may furnish the information called for by the Honourable Member in paragraph 3 of his note on page 12 *ante.*

For orders.

T.V.T.—10-7-12.

Chief Secretary—

L.J.P.J.—10-7-12.

Issue demi-official and put up a demi-official to the Inspector-General of Police sending him copy of the correspondence, page 6 (paragraph 2 of demi-official No. 4047-1, dated 14th September 1911), pages 7 to 9 (demi-official from the Resident in Travancore and Cochin to the Chief Secretary to Government, No. 50-11 Confdl.), dated 24th May 1912, and the reply.

A.G.C.—10-7-12.

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Mr. A. G. CARDEW, C.S.I., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
To—R. A. GRAHAM, Esq., I.C.S., Acting Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
Dated—Ootacamund, the 10th July 1912.
No.—1934-1, Judicial.

I am desired to acknowledge the receipt of your demi-official No. 50-11 (Confdl.), dated the 24th May 1912, on the subject of the measures to be taken to detect and prevent seditious conspiracies in Travancore.

2. I am to say that the proposed measures generally commend themselves to Government. They doubt, however, the expediency of the proposal to make periodical inquiries regarding the political feeling in the districts of Travancore which border on British India. Such inquiries would not be likely to elicit much useful information while they might do harm. Moreover, there would be a tendency on the part of the special officer to prove his zeal by collecting a mass of information of doubtful value. What is wanted is, as suggested by you, a continuous alertness on the part of the Travancore police who should promptly bring to notice the existence of seditious societies or literature.

3. The Government agree that Mr. George should be kept informed of all political matters that do or may concern Travancore. They do not consider it necessary to supply him with copies of all the periodical reports issued by the Madras Criminal Investigation Department, as the bulk of what is contained therein is in no way relevant to Travancore, but the Inspector-General will be instructed to send him special notes of any information that is likely to be of value and you, when you see him, can doubtless keep him informed of anything of importance.

Under Secretary—

The reply to the Resident having issued, a draft demi-official to the Inspector-General of Police is submitted for approval.

T.V.T.—15-7-12.

L.J.P.J.—16-7-12.

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Mr. A. G. CARDEW, C.S.I., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
To—the Hon'ble Mr. D. W. G. COWIE, I.C.S., Inspector-General of Police.
Dated—Ootacamund, the 17th July 1912.
No.—1934-2, Judicial.

I am desired to forward to you, for information and necessary action, copies of the correspondence between the Government and the Resident in Travancore and Cochin on the subject of the measures to be taken for the detection and suppression of seditious conspiracy and literature in the Travancore State.

2. In this connection, I am to enquire whether, in consultation with Mr. Longden, you wish to bring to the notice of Government any services of value recently rendered by the Travancore police.

Under Secretary—

The notes relating to the recognition by Government of the service rendered by Travancore officials in the investigation of the Tinnevelly conspiracy case have been extracted and added to the file on that subject. A draft order recording these notes is submitted for approval. (Perhaps the order may be printed).

Issue.
S.H.S.—14-8-12.

W.O.F.—13-8-12.

S.D.—13-8-12.

Yes.

S.H.S.—14-8-12.

[G.O. No. 1286, Judicial, dated 14th August 1912.]

FURTHER NOTES.

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Mr. D. W. G. COWIE, I.C.S., Inspector-General of Police.
To—the Hon'ble Mr. A. G. CARDEW, C.S.I., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—Madras, the 14th August 1912.
No.—20 (Confdl.).

With reference to paragraph 3 of demi-official No. 1934-1, dated 10th July 1912, from yourself to the Acting Resident in Travancore and Cochin and also your demi-official No. 1934-2, dated 17th July 1912, to me, I have to state that, in consultation with Longden, I propose to make the following arrangements with a view to assisting George with information that may be valuable to him in detecting and preventing seditious plots in Travancore :—

(1) Information on matters concerning Travancore will be sent to George by the Criminal Investigation Department through the Inspector-General.

(2) Information of the movements of "starred" suspects and any other temporary important suspect to Travancore will be sent to George direct and copies to Government by the Criminal Investigation Department.

2. I think that the Resident in Travancore and Cochin should also be instructed to see that the Superintendents of Police, in these States, keep themselves informed of—

(1) Political movements,

(2) Religious and social movements,

(3) Formations of political and social associations,

(4) The circulation of seditious literature.

and that Longden should also be kept informed, if necessary, on these matters through the Resident.

3. I also think and agree with Longden that some arrangement should be made between the British and State police forces for systematic surveillance of such suspects as may be handed over to the latter by us.

4. I do not anticipate that the Darbars will object to this necessary and probably very limited amount of secret surveillance work, and if the principle is approved the necessary working details can be settled between Longden and George at a personal interview.

Under Secretary—

Submitted for orders.

2. The proposals of the Inspector-General of Police in his demi-official No. 20 (Confidential), dated 14th August 1912, are, it is submitted, in accordance with the views expressed by Government.

"A" (Page 12 of notes to G.O. 1286, 14th August 1912.)

C.H.S.—24-8-12.

T.V.T.—26-8-12.

Chief Secretary—

[*J.S.*—I think the previous notes ought not to have been recorded. I did not understand that a reply would be sent by the Inspector-General. It would probably be best to add these notes to G.O. 1286, but please take instructions on return of the file.

S.H.S.—26-8-12.]

Not quite. Paragraph 2 goes further and proposes action of somewhat the same nature as the special enquiries to which the Honourable Member objected.

S.H.S.—26-8-12.

Honourable Member—

H.E. the Governor—

The Inspector-General may be told that, while the Superintendent should "keep himself informed" on the subjects named in paragraph 2, the Government deprecate special enquiries on these or similar matters.

A.G.C.—27-8-12.

H. A. S[TUART]—29-8-12.

I agree.

M. H[AMMICK]—30-8-12.

Under Secretary—

Draft demi-officials are submitted.

C.H.S.—5-9-12.

S.D.—6-9-12.

S.H.S.—6-9-12.

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Mr. A. G. CARDEW, C.S.I., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
To—R. A. GRAHAM, Esq., I.C.S., Acting Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
Dated—Ootacamund, the 7th September 1912.
No.—3710/A-1, Judicial.

I am desired to forward to you, for information, a copy of a demi-official from Cowie regarding the measures he proposes to take for the detection and prevention of seditious conspiracies in Travancore. Cowie has been informed that Government consider that the Superintendent of Police, Travancore, should keep himself informed on the subjects mentioned in paragraph 2 of his letter, but they deprecate special enquiries on these or similar matters.

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Mr. A. G. CARDEW, C.S.I., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
To—the Hon'ble Mr. D. W. G. COWIE, I.C.S., Inspector-General of Police.
Dated—Ootacamund, the 7th September 1912.
No.—3710/A-2, Judicial.

In reply to your demi-official No. 20 (Confidential) of the 14th August last, regarding the measures to be taken for the detection and prevention of seditious plots in Travancore, I am desired to inform you that, while considering that the Superintendents of Police in Travancore and Cochin should keep themselves informed of the matters referred to in paragraph 2 thereof, the Government deprecate special enquiries concerning these or similar matters. They approve your other proposals.

(Another Proof has been obtained from the Press)

Proof for approval only, 13/8/1

CONFIDENTIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—Papers regarding the measures to be taken for the detection and suppression of seditious conspiracy and literature in the Travancore State.

Order—No. 1286, Judicial, dated 14th August 1912.

Recorded.

(True Extract.)

A. G. Cardew,
Ag. Chief Secretary.

CONFIDENTIAL.

G.O. No. 1286, 14th August 1912.

Sedition.

Recording papers regarding the measures to be taken for the detection and suppression of seditious conspiracy and literature in the Travancore State.

Press

Strike.

CONFIDENTIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—Papers regarding the measures to be taken for the detection and suppression of seditious conspiracy and literature in the Travancore State.

Order—No. 1286, Judicial, dated 14th August 1912.

Recorded.

(True Extract.)

A. G. Cardew,
Ag. Chief Secretary.

CONFIDENTIAL.

G.O. No. 1286, 14th August 1912.

Sedition.

Recording papers regarding the measures to be taken for the detection and suppression of seditious conspiracy and literature in the Travancore State.

1518

Proof—for approval only, 15/8/12

CONFIDENTIAL.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 1286, JUDICIAL, DATED 14TH AUGUST 1912.

[SUBJECT.—*Sedition in the Travancore State.*]

Demi-official—from A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
To—the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.V.O., C.S.I., I.C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—Camp Courtallum, the 3rd August 1911.

With my "strictly confidential" demi-official, dated 31st July, despatched from Quilon, I sent you copy of a letter I had addressed to the Darbar protesting against the conduct of Mahadeva Aiyar, District Magistrate of Quilon, now on leave, who had so brow-beaten a witness who was alleged to have been ready to give useful information that the man fainted in Court.

My letter to the Darbar is dated 30th July and was based on a statement made by Sub-Inspector Kannan, of the Criminal Investigation Department, to the District Magistrate, Tinnevelly. On the afternoon of the 31st I saw Inspector Stevenage of the Travancore Police who was present in the verandah of the chattram while the witness (Subrahmaniyam) was being questioned by Mahadeva Aiyar. Stevenage said that when Subrahmaniyam found he was going to be taken before the District Magistrate he had already begun to waver and to pretend ignorance. When I asked him if he heard what went on inside, he said no. I asked him if he heard any words of abuse such as are attributed by the Criminal Investigation Department Sub-Inspector to Mahadeva Aiyar, and he again said no and added he thinks he would have heard them if they had been used. Shortly afterwards, he says, Subrahmaniyam came out supported between two men and sat down in the verandah in an exhausted condition. He said Subrahmaniyam was an obstinate man and several officials had been at him for some time but without success. I was not satisfied with Stevenage's version as he was palpably eager to minimise the fainting incident and to support his superiors in every way. I have since learnt that he wants to get a post as Market Inspector on his retirement which will be in a few days. He is very dependent therefore on the good word of his superior officers. As I had not received George's report about the incident which I asked for, I wired to George to come in and see me at Quilon on 1st August. His report had gone on to Trivandrum and back again, and I received it only on the 2nd August. He came in and told me that in this instance he does not for a moment believe that Mahadeva Aiyar tried to prevent Subrahmaniyam from speaking: on the other hand, Mahadeva Aiyar came to him and told him that Subrahmaniyam was obstinate and when he spoke harshly to him he had fallen down in a faint. George says that there was never any suggestion that Mahadeva Aiyar had *prevented* the man making a statement which he was willing to make; on the contrary, it was well known that Subrahmaniyam could say a good deal if he liked, but that all the efforts of the officials to make him speak had so far been unavailing although they had repeatedly assured him that he would not be made an accused. He thinks that Subrahmaniyam being pressed by his official superior—the chief official of the district—fainted through fright.

I place these fresh facts before you to know in what way Government consider they may be taken to affect the situation. I have pressed the Darbar to make a thorough enquiry into Mahadeva Aiyar's conduct in this matter. Shall it be left at that or, as I suggest, shall I write to the Darbar saying that, as it is known Mahadeva Aiyar is ill, the explanation which the Darbar will doubtless call for need not be sent till his leave expires* and pending its consideration I ask that he may be sent to another division?

A. T. FORBES.

* *Note.*—He had forty days' leave from 10th July.

Mahadeva Aiyar's previous conduct certainly raises a strong suspicion against him. On the other hand the Criminal Investigation Department Sub-Inspector's statement is silent as to what passed between Mahadeva Aiyar and Subrahmaniyam. He says he heard the District Magistrate utter the words "bastard son of an ass." And two minutes later Subrahmaniyam was carried

X

senseless into the verandah while Mahadeva Aiyar went off to see George. Stevenage, neither a very intelligent nor a very reliable witness, says he was at the door and heard no such words. But supposing some abusive words were used, is it more probable they were used to make an unwilling witness speak or to shut the mouth of a man ready to speak? Judging by probabilities, it seems unlikely that a Brahman would act in that open and clumsy manner if he wished to impose silence on a willing witness. And it is only the Sub-Inspector who represents Subrahmaniyam in that light, whereas we know from George that Subrahmaniyam was not a willing witness and he had obtained permission to bring him to Shencottah to see if he could be induced to speak when taken away from his own surroundings.

That the man was questioned—and harshly too according even to Mahadeva Aiyar's own admission to George—and that he fainted seem fairly well established: the question is whether Sub-Inspector Kannan has presented a true or a twisted view of the incident.

Previous papers at once please.

H. A. STUART—5-8-11.

Honourable Member (Judicial)—
H.E. the Governor—

With reference to this letter from Forbes, I invite attention to his letter of 3rd August placed below. It seems probable that the charges against Mahadeva Aiyar were not well founded. They were reported by Gillman, and I noted at the time that Gillman acted on hearsay and therefore in communicating them to Forbes I said that he was to make strong representations to the Darbar unless he found reason to believe that the charges were unfounded or exaggerated. (The papers are not available at the moment.)

Pages 21–22 of the notes to G.O. 1206, Judicial, 27th July 1911.

I think the Darbar may properly hold an enquiry into Mahadeva Aiyar's conduct, but this need not be held while he is ill.

H.A.S.—6-8-11.

I agree. Forbes can explain the matter as he explained it to us.

M. H[AMMICK]—6-8-11.

Demi-official—from A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
To—the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.V.O., C.S.I., I.C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—Camp Courtallum, the 4th August 1911.

With reference to my strictly confidential letter of the 3rd current, I enclose copies of a letter with enclosures which I received last night from the Acting Diwan and of my reply thereto. I request I may be informed by wire whether the preliminary enquiry may be deferred for another three weeks until Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar has sufficiently recovered to take part in it. He has had blood poisoning accompanied by profuse bleeding from the gums and discolouration in patches all over the body.

ENCLOSURES.

(1)

Demi-official—from the Acting Diwan of Travancore.
To—A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
Dated—the 2nd August 1911.

With reference to your strictly confidential note of the 30th ultimo, I beg to inform you that action will have to be taken against Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar under the rules regulating enquiries into the conduct of public servants passed by His Highness the Maharaja under date the 12th December 1896, published in page 284 of the Travancore English Almanac for 1898. A preliminary enquiry will have to be held in the first instance and in that enquiry a statement may also have to be taken from Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar. If from the preliminary enquiry it appears that there are sufficient grounds for holding a formal and public enquiry, a report will have to be submitted to His Highness and a Commission appointed by His Highness to hold the enquiry. On my way back from Shencottah I paid a visit to Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar but found him so weak and poorly that I did not think it advisable even to ask him to extend his leave. I was afraid that my advice might give rise to surmises and conjectures and interfere with his convalescence. I therefore thought it proper to write and ask Dr. Lakshmanan, who has been treating Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar, about his state of health, and copies of my note as well as of his reply I enclose for your information. Though reluctant to put off the enquiry asked for by you, I fear that the starting of the

enquiry now may prove dangerous to Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar's health in his present condition. Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar will be in fit condition according to Dr. Lakshmanan in about three weeks' time. May I therefore request you to kindly let me know whether, under the circumstances, the preliminary enquiry may not be deferred for three weeks? Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar's leave expires by the 19th instant.

Sub-Enclosure (i).

Demi-official—from the Acting Diwan of Travancore.
To—Dr. PETER N. LAKSHMANAN.
Dated—the 1st August 1911.

Kindly let me know what Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar's present state of health is, and favour me with your opinion as to whether he is just now in a fit condition to take part in any official enquiry or submit any official explanation without endangering his health and, if not, when he will be in a fit condition for the purpose.

Sub-Enclosure (ii).

Demi-official—from Dr. PETER N. LAKSHMANAN.
To—the Acting Diwan of Travancore.
Dated—the 1st August 1911.

Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar has practically recovered from the illness he was suffering from recently but is still in a convalescent state and weak.

I have strictly enjoined him to take complete rest and continue appropriate treatment and diet and, if he could manage it, to go out for a change as well to enable him to recover his strength.

In the interest of his health I am of opinion that it is best he took part in no official work or inquiry for at least three weeks more unless other complications, unforeseen now, followed necessitating a longer absence.

The longer the period of rest and change for him the better.

(2)

Demi-official—from A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
To—the Acting Diwan of Travancore.
Dated—the 4th August 1911.

In reply to your confidential letter of the 2nd current, I write to say that I have informed my Government of Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar's state of health and of your suggestion that the preliminary enquiry may be deferred for another three weeks, until he is sufficiently recovered to take part in it. Meanwhile I agree that enquiry may be postponed for the present.

Put up with papers circulated yesterday.

H.A.S.—7-8-11.

Under His Excellency's personal instructions the annexed telegram should issue at once and the demi-official by to-morrow's post. A demi-official received to-day is referred to in the draft telegram. That demi-official should be added to this file.

H.A.S.—7-8-11.

Telegram—from the Chief Secretary to Government.
To—the Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
Dated—Ootacamund, the 8th August 1911.

Your letters of 3rd and 4th. Government have no objection to [the] postponement of inquiry.

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.V.O., C.S.I., I.C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
To—A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
Dated—Ootacamund, the 9th August 1911.

I have just sent you a telegram saying that the Government have no objection to the postponement of the inquiry into Mahadeva Aiyar's conduct. I am desired to suggest that, in view of the doubt that has arisen regarding the truth of the charge brought against him, it would be well to take some means of modifying the terms of the representation made in your demi-official to the Diwan, dated 30th July 1911. You might explain matters to the Diwan as you have explained them to the Government.

Under Secretary—

Submitted to the Under Secretary for perusal.

T.V.T.—11-8-11.

Seen. The demi-official of the 31st July should be added to the confidential reports (kept by the General Utility Superintendent?) and a note should be made of the fact for the purposes of this file.

S. H. SLATER—12-8-11.

Demi-official—from A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
To—the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.V.O., C.S.I., I.C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—Trivandrum, the 22nd August 1911.

I have seen Mr. Rajagopalachari this morning and received from him typed copies of the statements made by Subrahmaniya Aiyar and by Nagam Pillai, the Tahsildar-Magistrate at Punalur at the period to which those statements relate. The Diwan has also forwarded Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar's own version of the incident. He was careful to state that it was not asked for in explanation of an allegation made against Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar which he was required to meet but for the information of the Diwan regarding an incident which had come to his notice and about which he wanted to get at the facts.

That Subrahmaniya Aiyar is a scoundrel there can be no doubt: his statement, especially the early part of it, shows that even to the Diwan he was fencing with the questions put to him but, shitty as he is, he makes it clear that what Mahadeva Aiyar did was to press him to speak out what he knew.

Nagam Pillai's statement is that he was in the verandah and heard Mahadeva Aiyar scolding Subrahmaniya Aiyar. He could not hear what was said, but presently Mahadeva Aiyar called him in and said the man was shamming fainting and asked him to lead him out and he did so. At Mahadeva Aiyar's direction he took his statement after Subrahmaniya Aiyar had lain down for a few minutes. The statement is a long one and is set out *in extenso* in Nagam Pillai's evidence.

Nagam Pillai says he read out this statement to Mahadeva Aiyar, who then directed him to take down the statements of some other persons also. He did so and the next day he took them along with Subrahmaniya Aiyar to Mr. George who examined them in his presence when they—including presumably Subrahmaniya Aiyar—repeated their statements of the previous day.

Mr. George is at Tinnevelly and the Diwan will question him on his return. I will then send up all the statements taken with my final remarks.

The second part of Mahadeva Aiyar's letter contains the explanation which he was called upon to furnish for not having placed on record or taken action on a report regarding the dissemination of seditious literature.

This may await the further report which the Resident promises.

H.A.S.—26-8-11.

Demi-official—from A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
To—the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.V.O., C.S.I., I.C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—Trivandrum, the 28th August 1911.

In my confidential demi-official of the 22nd I said I would forward the statements of the witnesses examined by the Diwan as soon as George, who was then at Tinnevelly, had been questioned.

I now forward (*a*) the statement of Subrahmaniya Aiyar, (*b*) the statement of Nagam Pillai, (*c*) Mahadeva Aiyar's letter to the Diwan containing his version of the brow-beating incident, (*d*) and (*e*) George's letters to the Diwan, after looking up his notes, on the subject of his examination of Subrahmaniya Aiyar and the date he first heard about the dissemination of seditious pamphlet.

The enclosures (*d*) and (*e*) were received by me only to-day and as it is a holiday I have not been able to get copies made. I accordingly forward the copies sent by the Diwan and request that when you have done with them you will return them to me to complete my file.

From George's letter (*d*) it will be seen that he saw Subrahmaniya Aiyar on 2nd July and with difficulty extracted a limited amount of information from him and noted against him "an absolute villain in my opinion" and that on the morning of the 4th he again saw him when he was brought by Nagam Pillai and he then made a much more detailed statement. George's letter thus corroborates Nagam Pillai's statement. At the same time it shows that Subrahmaniya Aiyar was a reluctant witness and that he was still untruthful when he was questioned by the Diwan for on this latter occasion Subrahmaniya Aiyar had the effrontery to say that when he had been examined by the Superintendent on the day previous to the date of the alleged brow-beating he had told Mr. George "all the facts which I subsequently related to Mr. Nagam Pillai."

George's letter also makes it clear that Mahadeva Aiyar himself told him of the "fainting" incident either on the same day or the next and he attached no significance to it.

I have no doubt, therefore, that so far as this charge—or rather allegation—is concerned, Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar must be exonerated of any intention or attempt to shut the mouth of a witness willing to give information.

As regards the other matter, viz., dissemination of seditious pamphlets, it is impossible to acquit Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar of great carelessness—to say the least—in keeping back the report. From paragraph (4) of his letter it would appear that he is sheltering himself behind the plea that Police Inspector Kumara Pillai was present when he got the report and as "he seemed to know what was going on" and was also going to see Mr. George, he thought he would give him full information. But the Inspector apparently did not know and it is certain that Mr. George only heard of it several days later. Moreover, that report contained much information about various other important matters which should have been imparted as early as possible to Mr. George. However, the Diwan is enquiring further into this matter and, as it is not directly connected with the Subrahmaniya Aiyar incident which evoked my letter to the Darbar asking for an enquiry, I think the two subjects may be kept separate.

If Government is satisfied with the evidence now forwarded regarding the Subrahmaniya Aiyar incident, I suggest that I should intimate to the Darbar in a confidential letter that I have reported to my Government that the statements taken show that the interpretation placed on Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar's conduct was a mistaken one and that Government accept his version of the incident.

Under Secretary—

Submitted for orders with reference to the Chief Secretary's note on the demi-official, dated the 22nd August.

T.V.T.—4-9-11.

Chief Secretary—

S.H.S.—4-9-11.

Hon'ble Sir Murray Hammick—

H.E. the Governor—

Mr. Forbes may take the action suggested at the end of his letter. There is not any evidence of value that Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar tried to bully Subrahmaniya Aiyar into holding his tongue. The Criminal Investigation Department Sub-Inspector jumped to that conclusion because Subrahmaniya Aiyar evidently did not tell all he knew. It is to be hoped he will be dismissed.

> No evidence at all.
> M. H[AMMICK]—8-9-11.
> None.
> A. L[AWLEY]—10-9-11.

2. Mr. Forbes may be asked to ascertain what steps the Darbar is taking to prevent and detect seditious plots in Travancore. We can't say much about the past for our own arrangements were seriously defective.

> I agree.
> M. H[AMMICK]—8-9-11.
> Yes.
> A. L[AWLEY]—10-9-11.

H.A.S.—6-9-11.
M. H[AMMICK]—8-9-11.
A. L[AWLEY]—10-9-11.

Under Secretary—

Draft demi-official to Mr. Forbes submitted.

T.V.T.—12-9-11.

Chief Secretary—

S.H.S.—12-9-11.

Issue.

H.A.S.—12-9-11.

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.V.O., C.S.I., I.C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
To—A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
Dated—Ootacamund, the 14th September 1911.
No.—4047-1, Judicial.

With reference to your demi-official, dated the 28th August 1911, I am desired to inform you that after perusing the papers, the Government are satisfied that the interpretation put upon Mahadeva Aiyar's conduct was mistaken and that you may accordingly take the action suggested at the end of your letter.

2. I am at the same time to ask you to ascertain and report to Government what steps the Darbar is taking to prevent and detect seditious plots in Travancore.

Demi-official—from A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
To—the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.V.O., C.S.I., I.C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—Trivandrum, the 11th November 1911.
No.—50-1 (Confdl).

With reference to your confidential demi-official No. 4047-1, dated 14th September 1911, I write to inform you that the Darbar fully realises the serious gravity of the matter and states that effective action will soon be taken to prevent a recurrence of the incidents referred to. The Darbar, however, feels that it would be well to await the disposal of the cases pending before the Madras High Court so that it may deal with the situation in the light of the evidence adduced and the findings thereon of the Madras High Court. The Darbar enquires whether there is any objection to a little delay in the matter. In the meantime the Darbar has asked Mr. George, the Superintendent of Police, to submit a full report on the incidents in Travancore so far as they have come within his knowledge during his investigation. This is necessary in the opinion of the Darbar, as all the evidence obtained by Mr. George does not appear to have been put in before the Indian courts. A special reporter has also been engaged to take down the whole evidence given in the High Court which is being printed. The Darbar has promised to send me a copy of the printed evidence soon after the case is over. I think that in the circumstances the Darbar's request that it may defer setting out detailed proposals till the evidence is before it in convenient form is reasonable and may be approved.

Under Secretary—

Submitted for orders as to the reply.

T.V.T.—15-11-11.

Chief Secretary—

Mr. Forbes' proposal at the end of his letter may be approved. Mr. Napier told me the other day that the case in the High Court would probably go on until after the Christmas holidays.

C. A. SOUTER—16-11-11.

Yes.

H.A.S.—16-11-11.

Under Secretary—

Draft demi-official to Mr. Forbes submitted.

T.V.T.—18-11-11.

Issue.

C.A.S.—18-11-11.

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Sir HAROLD STUART, K.C.V.O., C.S.I., I.C.S., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
To—A. T. FORBES, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
Dated—Fort St. George, the 18th November 1911.
No. 4047-2, Judicial.

With reference to your demi-official No. 50-1 (Confdl.), dated the 11th instant, I am desired to inform you that the Government have no objection to the Darbar deferring action as proposed.

Demi-official—from R. A. GRAHAM, Esq., I.C.S., Acting Resident in Travancore and Cochin.

To—the Hon'ble Mr. A. G. CARDEW, C.S.I., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.

Dated—Camp Mattupatti, the 24th May 1912.

No.—50-11 (Confdl.).

I enclose a copy of a letter I have received from the Diwan of Travancore on the subject of the measures to be taken to detect and prevent seditious conspiracies in future.

2. The Diwan first asks that there shall be a more full and free communication between the British and Travancore Police in future than there has been in the past in regard to the movements of suspicious persons and to the existence of seditious movements likely to spread from British territory into Travancore. I believe it has not been customary in the past for the Criminal Investigation Department to communicate with the Superintendent of Police in Travancore; but under present circumstances there seems no reason why this should not be done.

3. He goes on to suggest that special enquiries should be undertaken from time to time by members of the police force (apparently) deputed for the purpose as to the feeling of the public in political matters, especially how they feel towards the British Government; to promise that a careful watch shall be kept on the accused acquitted in the recent conspiracy trial, and also on the convicted accused after their release from imprisonment; to state that if any officer can be singled out for special commendation in connection with the enquiries made after the murder of Mr. Ashe, such officer will be suitably rewarded, so that all officers in the service of the Darbar may know what importance is attached to effective action on such occasions; and finally to ask for any further advice which Government may wish to give.

4. As you know, these are more or less the suggestions which I made to the Diwan. I did not mean, however, that some particular officer who had done good work should be given some specific reward; but rather that those who had been found to have helped materially in the unravelling of the conspiracy should all be regarded with some special favour; and I have communicated to the Diwan the Government's opinion that the Darbar might also make it plain that those who are known to have been apathetic in the matter or have shown any sympathy with criminal conspiracies or conspirators must expect no official favour or advancement. I think also it should be impressed on all officials that it is their duty to report at once the existence of any societies of a seditious or objectionable tendency or the importation or propagation of obnoxious literature, and that serious notice should be taken of any failure in this respect. The scope of the proposed periodical enquiries should also be enlarged to cover these matters; and particular care will have to be taken in the selection of the persons entrusted with those enquiries. The Travancore Police is not noted either for capacity or for energy, and Mr. George has considerable difficulty, I believe, in ordinary enquiries, which will be enhanced in respect of enquiries into the actions and tendencies of persons in higher social positions than common criminals. The enquiries and the selection should, as far as possible, be left in his hands or should at least be made in consultation with him in order that there may be no interference with his authority over his subordinates. Beyond this, I have no suggestions to make.

ENCLOSURE.

Demi-official—from the Diwan of Travancore.

To—the Resident in Travancore and Cochin.

Dated—the 25th April 1912.

I write to reply to Mr. Forbes' demi-official to me, dated 17th September 1911, enquiring, with reference to the facts disclosed during the investigation into the murder of Mr. Ashe, what action the Darbar had taken or proposed to take for the detection of seditious plots in the State. As already stated by me in my letter to Mr. Forbes, dated 1st November 1911, the Darbar fully realises the importance of the matter and is prepared to take such action as would prevent a recurrence of the incidents brought to light.

2. The Darbar has now had the opportunity of perusing the judgments of the Madras High Court in Special Bench Case No. 1 of 1911. Of the fourteen accused charged in that case, Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 14 belong to Travancore; and of these all except Nos. 8 and 9 are natives of Shencottah. No. 8 belongs to Punalur and so also No. 9. All the Travancore accused (along with the other accused) have been acquitted of the abetment, by conspiracy, of Mr. Ashe's murder, but four of the Travancore accused, namely, Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 14, have been convicted of conspiracy within section 121-A of the Penal Code. The Special Bench find that the conspiracy had its inception early in April 1910, with the advent of the 1st accused Nilakanta at Tenkāsi, where a meeting was held on the 10th April, at which an oath was taken for the purpose of a general rising to drive out the British from the country. Admittedly no Travancoreans were present at this meeting. Later on, Nilakanta visited Cochin, Alleppey and Quilon, but there is no evidence as to how he occupied his time during this visit.

The second meeting was held at Tuticorin, about the middle of July, at which meeting also an oath was taken, as at the first meeting, but here again there were no Travancoreans present. The third meeting was at Punalur, and it was attended by the 6th, 7th and 8th accused, but no sedition was talked. Then two meetings were held at Shencottah, the fourth and fifth meetings which were attended by the 6th, 11th and 14th accused, the assassin Vanchi Aiyar and the deceased Dharmaraja Aiyar, but it does not appear that any oath was taken at these meetings; but the 1st accused Nilakanta harangued the others on the miserable economic condition of India and wound up with the pressing necessity of exterminating the English. The sixth meeting was held at Punalur, where oath was taken by, among others, the assassin Vanchi, the deceased Dharmaraja and the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th and 14th accused. It also appears from the judgment of the High Court (I am speaking of the judgment of the majority of the Judges) that before the advent of the first accused Nilakanta, there was a secret society at Shencottah, called the Bharatha Mata Association, of which the assassin Vanchi, the deceased Dharmaraja and the accused Nos. 6, 7 and 14 were members; but though the society was clearly of a seditious tendency, its object being to procure, read and discuss papers from Pondicherry, its members as such did not bring themselves in any way within the reach of the law. The actual murder of Mr. Ashe appears to have been resolved upon at Ottappidāram, according to the prosecution 12th witness, at the house of one Madasami; the only Travancorean then present was the assassin Vanchi Aiyar. About April or May 1911 there were two further meetings held at Shencottah, in the houses of the 11th and 12th accused, which were attended by the 6th, 7th, 8th and 14th accused, the assassin Vanchi and the deceased Dharmaraja Aiyar. At these two meetings the assassin Vanchi took the lead (Nilakanta not being present) and expatiated upon the necessity of developing the resources of the country and driving out the English. The Judges have recorded the opinion that every person who attended *and took the blood oath* was guilty of joining in a conspiracy punishable under section 121-A of the Penal Code. So far as the evidence let in before the Special Tribunal goes, only *one* of the *three* oath meetings was held in Travancore territory, the other two being held in British territory. My object in mentioning this specifically is not by any means to minimise the seriousness of the thing so far as Travancore is concerned, but to point out that, if the executive officers of Travancore were out of touch with what was going on, the blame can hardly be laid more upon them than on the executive officers of the adjoining British district. The fact seems to be that no body had any idea, either in the Tinnevelly district or in the Shencottah and Punalur taluks of the Travancore State, that a thing like this was brewing. It is now clear that the murder of Mr. Ashe itself was not contemplated by the conspirators as a body. It was the individual act of a member of the organisation who happened to be a Travancorean and whose passion must have been inflamed by the seditious literature he had been reading and by the malign influence exercised over him from Pondicherry and Ottappidāram.

3. The chief thing that I would suggest for preventing a recurrence of seditious plots like these is that there should be full and free exchange of information (in regard to matters like these) between the British and Travancore Police. It does not appear to have been so in the past. In the present case, as already stated, the conspiracy began in British territory; it then extended into the two taluks of Travancore adjoining the British district of Tinnevelly; in both these taluks, Shencottah specially, there were men related to the disaffected classes in British India and sympathising with them. If any intimation or warning had been given to the Travancore Police that a criminal movement like this had originated in British territory and was likely to spread into Travancore, of course a rigorous watch would have been kept. As it was, the one thing which the Travancore Executive was not prepared for was that any portion of Travancore territory would be used as a base for seditious action against the Paramount Power. Also I would point out that the 1st accused Nilakanta, who is found to have organised the whole thing, was a man of Tanjore district; his last employment was an editor of a vernacular paper published at Pondicherry, which was proscribed by the Madras Government in March 1910. This man came to Tenkāsi, where he started his organisation; and he later on came into Travancore territory. He spent his time (about five months) between Tenkāsi, Tuticorin, Courtallum, Shencottah, Punalur and Alleppey. A man like that was presumably being watched by the Criminal Investigation Department. If so, I submit that intimation of his having entered Travancore territory should have been conveyed to the Travancore Police. The first thing therefore that I would suggest is that arrangements should be made for greater co-ordination between the British and Travancore Police than is visible in this case. Without such co-ordination, all other precautions that may be taken would be comparatively futile. The Darbar of course recognises the obligation lying on it to watch all suspects coming from British territory, but I submit that this obligation cannot be satisfactorily discharged unless the movement of these suspects from British into Travancore territory is notified systematically to the executive officers of the Darbar.

4. Another point which I have considered carefully is whether an organisation corresponding to the British Criminal Investigation Department may not be started in Travancore. I feel that the idea is not practical. Travancore is after all not very much more in size than an average Madras district; and in population it is not more than, say, two Madras districts. I hardly think that this area or population would justify the creation of *two* agencies for police work, a normal and a special one. The chances are that there would be friction between the two agencies and any advantage we may have by having a confidential branch to deal with matters like these will be nullified by the circumstance that the men in the Secret Branch will very soon become known to the people among whom they work. I would therefore deprecate the organisation of a special or secret branch of the police. At the same time, after what has taken place, it is necessary to make enquiries from time to time, especially in the border taluks, as to the feeling of the public in political matters, especially how they feel towards the British Government. This can be done through the existing police force by deputing from time to time a special man for the purpose of making a careful enquiry in the matter.

5. The 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th accused are the four Travancoreans who have been acquitted by the High Court. These will of course be watched. And so also the convicted Travancoreans, namely, the 6th, 7th, 8th and 14th accused, when they return after serving their terms of punishment

6. In regard to the investigation conducted by the British Police *after* the incident, I have no hesitation in repeating to you that I have already said to Mr. Forbes that the officers of Travancore have been doing all that they could to co-operate with the British police; the circumstance that the trial has ended in the conviction of so many as nine accused, of whom four are Travancoreans, may be taken to be a proof of my statement. Mr. George has sent me a report on the whole case, and I gather generally from that report that he and his men did all that was possible by way of co-operating with and helping their brethren over the frontier. I am also looking over the file of correspondence to see if any of the Darbar officers did *particularly* good work in this direction, and, if I find that any officer could be singled out for *special* commendation and preferment, I shall see that he is suitably rewarded, so that all officers in the service of the Darbar may know what importance is attached to effective action on occasions like these.

7. In conclusion, I feel that this communication is not as precise as I would wish. You may rest assured of the Darbar's anxiety to prevent the occurrence of plots like these and of its readiness to take such steps as may be necessary for the purpose. The difficulty, however, is to say what exactly could be done beyond what of course it is our obvious duty to do. The Darbar will deem it a favour if the Madras Government will give the matter their consideration and give the Darbar their advice which, I need hardly assure you, will be gladly acted upon.

Under Secretary—

The Resident's demi-official is submitted for orders.

2. The demi-official is apparently intended as a reply to this Government's demi-official No. 4047-1, Judicial, dated 14th September 1911, enquiring, what action the Darbar proposes to take to detect and prevent seditious plots in Travancore.

3. For orders as to whether the views of the Inspector-General of Police may be invited on these proposals u.o. He will no doubt consult the Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Criminal Investigation Department and Railways.

T.V.T.—7-6-12.

Chief Secretary—

I think the file may be sent u.o. to the Inspector-General of Police for his opinion.

L. J. P. JOLLY—7-6-12.

Under Secretary—

Please see demi-official C. No. 89, Political, dated 1st May 1912, in Stolmenberg file in sealed cover.

V.S.M.—10-6-12.

I had not seen this correspondence before, but a demi-official was sent to the Resident about a month ago on the subject of the Darbar's attitude towards loyal and disloyal Government officials. Please put that up. It was issued in Political.

A. G. CARDEW—8-6-12.

Chief Secretary—

L.J.P.J.—10-6-12.

I want to know whether the various Criminal Investigation Department periodical reports are sent (1) to the Resident or Political Agent, (2) the Darbar of any Native State.

A.G.C.—11-6-12.

Under Secretary—

The Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Criminal Investigation Department and Railways, may be requested u.o. to kindly furnish the particulars wanted by the Chief Secretary as they are not easily traceable in the office and as the Superintendent, Government Press, knows only about the distribution of confidential newspaper reports.

T.V.T.—17-6-12.

Send u.o. to the Deputy Inspector-General.

L.J.P.J.—18-6-12.

CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION DEPARTMENT.

The Special Branch publish (1) and (2): the Criminal Investigation Department (3):—

(1) Secret Abstract.
(2) Weekly Newspaper Report.
(3) Criminal Intelligence Gazette.

2. The *Secret Abstract* is sent to—

(1) Resident in Hyderabad.
(2) Resident in Mysore.
(3) Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
(4) Inspector-General of Police, Ceylon.

It is *not* sent to any Darbars.

3. The *Weekly Newspaper Report* is sent to—

(1) Resident in Mysore.
(2) Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana.
(3) Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General in Central India.
(4) Resident in Hyderabad.
(5) Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
(6) Resident in Nepal.

It is *not* sent to any Darbars.

4. The *Criminal Intelligence Gazette* is distributed to Residents, Agents and Darbars as shown in the accompanying two lists.

C. LONGDEN—21-6-12.

ENCLOSURES.

(1)

List of Residents or Political Agents to whom copies of the "Madras Criminal Intelligence Gazette", published by the Criminal Investigation Department, Madras, are sent.

Designation of the officer.	Station.
List of Residents.	
1. The Resident in Mysore	Bangalore.
2. The Resident in Travancore	Trivandrum.
3. The District Magistrate, Mercara	Coorg.
List of Political Agents.	
1. The Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General of India, Central India Agency.	Indore.
2. His Majesty's Consul at Pondicherry	Pondicherry.
3. The Superintendent-General of Police, Mount Abu.	Rajputana.

(2)

List of Darbars to whom copies of the "Madras Criminal Intelligence Gazette", published by the Criminal Investigation Department, Madras, are sent.

Designation of the officer.	Name of the State.
1. Inspector-General of Police, Gwalior, Central India.	Gwalior.
2. Inspector-General of Police, Indore	Indore.
3. Do. Marwar	Marwar.
4. Do. Jind	Phulkian States and Bhawalpur.
5. The City Magistrate	Jaipur.
6. The Superintendent of Gerai	Jaipur.
7. The Commissioner of Police, Baroda	Baroda.
8. The Superintendent of Police	Ajmere.
9. Do. Travancore ...	Travancore.
10. Do. Jalandur Division.	Maler-Katla.
11. Do. Lahore Division ...	Chamba.
12. Do.	Bhawalpur.
13. Do.	Bundi.
14. The Superintendent of Police and Gerai	Kishengar (Rajputana).

List of Darbars to whom copies of the "Madras Criminal Intelligence Gazette", published by the Criminal Investigation Department, Madras, are sent—cont.

	Designation of the officer.	Name of the State.
15.	The Superintendent-General of State Police, Bikaneer, Rajputana.	Bikaneer.
16.	The Superintendent of State Police	Bharatpur.
17.	The Assistant Superintendent of Police, Delhi Division (Nahan State).	Sirmur.
18.	The Kotwal in charge of Tonk Police Force, Rajputana.	Tonk.
19.	The Inspector-General of Police, Mysore	Mysore.
20.	The Pudukkōttai Darbar	Pudukkōttai.
21.	The Mahakamaikas Chief Council, Mewar, Rajputana.	Mewar.
22.	The Inspector-General of Police, Jalandur Division.	Kapurthala.
23.	The Inspector-General of Police and Jails ...	Hyderabad (Deccan).
24.	The Assistant Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department.	Do.
25.	The Deputy Inspector-General of Police in charge of His Highness the Nizam's State Railway Police.	Secunderabad (Hyderabad State).
26	The Inspector of Police, Jalundur Division ...	Faridkote.
27.	The Superintendent of Police	Cochin State.
28.	Do.	Alwar.
29.	The Diwan	Kotah.
30.	Do.	Jhalwar.
31.	Do.	Sakti (Central Provinces).
32.	The Feudatory Chief	Kankar (Central Provinces).
33.	Do.	Khariagarh (Central Provinces).
34.	Do.	Raigarh (Central Provinces).
35.	Do.	Patna, Bolangir (Central Provinces).
36.	Do.	Bamra (Central Provinces).
37.	Do.	Rampur, Rehrakhol (Central Provinces).
38.	Do.	Makrai (Central Provinces).
39.	The Maharaja and Feudatory Chief	Sonpur Feudatory State.
40.	The Superintendent	Bastar, Jagadalpur.
41.	Do.	Nandgaon State.
42.	Do.	Chhuikhadan (Central Provinces).
43.	Do.	Kawardha.
44.	Do.	Sarangarh.
45.	Do.	Kalahandi.
46.	The Superintendent of Police	Shapura (Rajputana).
47.	The Mekhmakas	Dungarpur (Do.).
48.	Do.	Partabgar (Do.).
49.	Do.	Banswara (Do.).

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

Under Secretary—

With reference to the Chief Secretary's query on page 9 *ante* the Criminal Investigation Department note is submitted for perusal.

T.V.T.—25-6-12.

Chief Secretary—

L.J.P.J.—25-6-12.

Honourable Member—

H.E. the Governor—

Please see notes on page 5 to which the Resident's letter, dated 24th May 1912, on page 7 relates.

2. The most important suggestion made by the Diwan of Travancore is that there should be "full and free exchange of information between the British and Travancore "police," and that arrangements should be made for greater co-ordination between the two than has hitherto been the case. It appears from the Criminal Investigation Department report, dated 21st June 1912, that the Secret Abstract is sent to the Resident

in Travancore and Cochin, but not to the Darbar. It is, I think, undesirable to send it to the Darbar. But I think that it might be sent demi-officially to the Travancore Superintendent of Police direct, as a personal matter and so long as Mr. George is there, for perusal *and return*. The communication should not become a regular routine and should be done each week under the orders of the Deputy Inspector-General. The Inspector-General might be asked whether he can suggest any further measures of co-ordination between the British and State police.

3. The Diwan's second suggestion that an officer might be deputed from time to time to make special enquiries "as to the feeling of the public in political matters" may be approved, though the proposed object of enquiry does not seem likely to be very fruitful of results.

4. Mr. Graham's suggestion that it should be impressed upon all officials that it is their duty to report the existence of seditious societies or literature should, I think, also be given effect to.

A.G.C.—26-6-12.

I agree that Mr. George should be kept informed of all political matters that do or may concern Travancore, but it would be better to send him special notes of such information rather than to send him a copy of the abstract which contains a good deal of information that in no way concerns Travancore. If we once begin sending the whole abstract to the Travancore Superintendent, it will be difficult to stop it.

I agree.
M. H[AMMICK]—29-6-12.

2. I do not approve of the Diwan's proposal to make periodical inquiries regarding the political feeling in the districts of Travancore which border on British India. Such enquiries are not likely to do much good and may do a great deal of harm. The special officer would be unable to keep his inquiries secret and he might arouse the very feeling which we hope will disappear. Moreover, there would be a tendency on his part to prove his zeal by collecting a lot of information of very doubtful value. What is wanted is a continuous alertness on the subject and the superior officers of the Travancore police, as suggested by Mr. Graham and approved in paragraph 4 of the Chief Secretary's note.

I agree.
M. H[AMMICK]—29-6-12.

3. The Criminal Investigation Department may be asked whether they wish to bring to notice any services of value rendered by the Travancore police.

I agree.
M. H[AMMICK]—29-6-12.

H. A. S[TUART]—28-6-12.

I agree to the above. I suppose the Resident in Travancore sees the Travancore Inspector-General of Police from time to time and he could by word of mouth give him any intelligence he gets from the Criminal Investigation Department reports. It would not of course do for the Resident to be in regular communication with the Inspector-General, but a good Resident could always manage to let the Inspector-General know anything of importance.

I don't think the Inspector-General, Travancore, should get the Criminal Investigation Department abstracts, but the Inspector-General, Madras, could always arrange to let him know of anything of interest and importance which related to Travancore.

M. H[AMMICK]—29-6-12.

Chief Secretary—

I doubt whether the opinions of Government should be formulated in a Government Order; it will, I think, suffice to communicate them to the Resident by demi-official.

L.J.P.J.—4-7-12.

Yes; the demi-official form should certainly be used.

A.G.C.—4-7-12.

Under Secretary—

A draft demi-official to the Resident is submitted for approval. It is presumed that there will be a formal official communication from the Resident later on regarding the measures to be adopted. In any case it seems necessary, after the issue of the demi-official, to send the file u o. to the Inspector-General of Police in order that he may know what is expected of him and that he may furnish the information called for by the Honourable Member in paragraph 3 of his note on page 12 *ante*.

For orders.

T.V.T.—10-7-12.

Chief Secretary—

L.J.P.J.—10-7-12.

16 Issue demi-official and put up a demi-official to the Inspector-General of Police sending him copy of the correspondence, page ~~20~~ 7 (paragraph ~~24~~ 1) pages ~~23–30~~ 7 to 9 (D.O. from the Resdt, T. and C. to the Chief Secy to Govt, No 50-11 Confdl dd 24-5-12; 5 of D.O. No 4047-1 dated 14th Septr 1911.) and the reply.

A.G.C.—10-7-12.

pages need correction AGC

Press don't Print

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Mr. A. G. CARDEW, C.S.I., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.

To—R. A. GRAHAM, Esq., I.C.S., Acting Resident in Travancore and Cochin.

Dated—Ootacamund, the 10th July 1912.

No.—1934-1, Judicial.

I am desired to acknowledge the receipt of your demi-official No. 50-11 (Confdl.), dated the 24th May 1912, on the subject of the measures to be taken to detect and prevent seditious conspiracies in Travancore.

2. I am to say that the proposed measures generally commend themselves to Government. They doubt, however, the expediency of the proposal to make periodical inquiries regarding the political feeling in the districts of Travancore which border on British India. Such inquiries would not be likely to elicit much useful information while they might do harm. Moreover, there would be a tendency on the part of the special officer to prove his zeal by collecting a mass of information of doubtful value. What is wanted is, as suggested by you, a continuous alertness on the part of the Travancore police who should promptly bring to notice the existence of seditious societies or literature.

3. The Government agree that Mr. George should be kept informed of all political matters that do or may concern Travancore. They do not consider it necessary to supply him with copies of all the periodical reports issued by the Madras Criminal Investigation Department, as the bulk of what is contained therein is in no way relevant to Travancore, but the Inspector-General will be instructed to send him special notes of any information that is likely to be of value and you, when you see him, can doubtless keep him informed of anything of importance.

Under Secretary—

The reply to the Resident having issued, a draft demi-official to the Inspector-General of Police is submitted for approval.

T.V.T.—15-7-12.

L.J.P.J.—16-7-12.

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Mr. A. G. CARDEW, C.S.I., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.

To—the Hon'ble Mr. D. W. G. COWIE, I.C.S., Inspector-General of Police.

Dated—Ootacamund, the 17th July 1912.

No.—1934-2, Judicial.

I am desired to forward to you, for information and necessary action, copies of the correspondence between the Government and the Resident in Travancore and Cochin on the subject of the measures to be taken for the detection and suppression of seditious conspiracy and literature in the Travancore State.

2. In this connection, I am to enquire whether, in consultation with Mr. Longden, you wish to bring to the notice of Government any services of value recently rendered by the Travancore police.

Under Secretary—

The notes relating to the recognition by Government of the service rendered by Travancore officials in the investigation of the Tinnevelly conspiracy case have been extracted and added to the file on that subject. A draft order recording these notes is submitted for approval. (Perhaps the order may be printed).

Issue.

S.H.S.—14-8-12.

W.O.F.—13-8-12.

S.D.—13-8-12.

Yes.

S.H.S.—14-8-12.

[G.O. No. 1286, Judicial, dated 14th August 1912.]

Pages 14 and 15 are submitted for approval and answering queries. Please also answer the query on page 9 of the notes.

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Mr. D. W. G. COWIE, I.C.S., Inspector-General of Police.
To—the Hon'ble Mr. A. G. CARDEW, C.S.I., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—Madras, the 14th August 1912.
No.—20 (Confdl.).

With reference to paragraph 3 of demi-official No. 1934-1, dated 10th July 1912, from yourself to the Acting Resident in Travancore and Cochin and also your demi-official No. 1934-2, dated 17th July 1912, to me, I have to state that, in consultation with Longden, I propose to make the following arrangements with a view to assisting George with information that may be valuable to him in detecting and preventing seditious plots in Travancore :—

(1) Information on matters concerning Travancore will be sent to George by the Criminal Investigation Department through the Inspector-General.

(2) Information of the movements of "starred" suspects and any other temporary important suspect to Travancore will be sent to George direct and copies to Government by the Criminal Investigation Department.

2. I think that the Resident in Travancore and Cochin should also be instructed to see that the Superintendents of Police, in these States, keep themselves informed of—

(1) Political movements,
(2) Religious and social movements,
(3) Formations of political and social associations,
(4) The circulation of seditious literature,

and that Longden should also be kept informed, if necessary, on these matters through the Resident.

3. I also think and agree with Longden that some arrangement should be made between the British and State police forces for systematic surveillance of such suspects as may be handed over to the latter by us.

4. I do not anticipate that the Darbars will object to this necessary and probably very limited amount of secret surveillance work, and if the principle is approved the necessary working details can be settled between Longden and George at a personal interview.

Under Secretary—

Submitted for orders.

2. The proposals of the Inspector-General of Police in his demi-official No. 20 (Confidential), dated 14th August 1912, are, it is submitted, in accordance with the views expressed by Government.

"A" (Page 12 of notes to G.O. 1286, 14th August 1912.)

C.H.S.—24-8-12.
T.V.T.—26-8-12.

Chief Secretary—

[*J.S.*—I think the previous notes ought not to have been recorded. I did not understand that a reply would be sent by the Inspector-General. It would probably be best to add these notes to G.O. 1286, but please take instructions on return of the file.

S.H.S.—25-6-12.]

Not quite. Paragraph 2 goes further and proposes action of somewhat the same nature as the special enquiries to which the Honourable Member objected.

S.H.S.—26-8-12.

Honourable Member—
H.E. the Governor—

The Inspector-General may be told that, while the Superintendent should "keep "himself informed" on the subjects named in paragraph 2, the Government deprecate special enquiries on these or similar matters.

A.G.C.—27-8-12.
H. A. S[TUART]—29-8-12.

I agree.

M. H[AMMICK]—30-8-12.

Under Secretary—

Draft demi-officials are submitted.

C.H.S.—5-9-12.
S.D.—6-9-12.

S.H.S.—6-9-12.

[Issued as demi-officials Nos. 3710-1, dated 7th September 1912, and 3710-2, dated 7th September 1912.]

(This may be omitted ?)

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Mr. A. G. CARDEW, C.S.I., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.

To—R. A. GRAHAM, Esq., I.C.S., Acting Resident in Travancore and Cochin.

Dated—Ootacamund, the 7th September 1912.

No.—3710/A-1, Judicial.

I am desired to forward to you, for information, a copy of a demi-official from Cowie regarding the measures he proposes to take for the detection and prevention of seditious conspiracies in Travancore. Cowie has been informed that Government consider that the Superintendent of Police, Travancore, should keep himself informed on the subjects mentioned in paragraph 2 of his letter, but they deprecate special enquiries on these or similar matters.

Demi-official—from the Hon'ble Mr. A. G. CARDEW, C.S.I., Acting Chief Secretary to Government.

To—the Hon'ble Mr. D. W. G. COWIE, I.C.S., Inspector-General of Police.

Dated—Ootacamund, the 7th September 1912.

No.—3710/A-2, Judicial.

In reply to your demi-official No. 20 (Confidential) of the 14th August last, regarding the measures to be taken for the detection and prevention of seditious plots in Travancore, I am desired to inform you that, while considering that the Superintendents of Police in Travancore and Cochin should keep themselves informed of the matters referred to in paragraph 2 thereof, the Government deprecate special enquiries concerning these or similar matters. They approve your other proposals.

PRESS SLIP.

,000—27-4-11

ORDINARY. ~~PREFERENCE.~~ ~~URGENT (a).~~

Jud[l] DEPARTMENT.

Current No.........., dated.................................191 .

G.O., No. 1286, dated 14 — 8 — 1912.

Number of MS. pages sent { Correspondence (b) — ; Notes (b[1]) 49 }

Brief subject Sedition

Number (a) of copies required when struck off (*not including copies for volumes and editors' table which are retained in the Press*)	E. T. copies to supply requisitions for purchase by the public.	Complete correspondence and orders.	Notes.
For Record.*			
Madras Records	4	25	15
Ooty Records		3	3
For filing with original ...		1	1
Total ...		29	19

For Issue.†	Letter only.	Complete G.O.	Special issue copies (b) of G.O. — No.	Special issue copies of G.O. — Papers.	Notes.
Signature copies..................					
India Office..................					
Govt. of India..........Dept.					
Revenue Department..........					
Public Works Department..........					
Local and Municipal Department..........					
Educational Department..........					
..........................Dept.					
Public Dept., Judicial Dept., Political, Financial Dept., Marine Dept., Ecclesiastical Dept. } Total..........					
Total ...					
Spare copies: The..........					
The..........					
The..........					
The..........					
The..........					
The..........					
The..........					
The..........					
The..........					
The..........					
The..........					
The..........					
The..........					
The..........					
The..........					
Total ...					

* Copies distributed on..........................‡(Press Clerk.)

† Copies distributed on..........................‡(Press Despatcher.)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SECRETARIAT.

(*a*) If a paper is marked to be printed urgently, the Superintendent of the section concerned should sign the Press slip. The Superintendent should exercise a careful discretion in the matter.

(*b*) Each letter, memorandum, or order, or set of orders, in the file of correspondence should be headed in succession with the Roman numeral I, II, III, etc., the number being written in red ink or blue chalk above the item. The particular papers to be printed in the special issue-copies should be indicated by the Roman numeral (I, II, etc.) by which that item has been headed in the correspondence file. All matter, including marginal remarks or references, to be printed should be written in ink and matter which should not be printed should be encircled. Initials and signatures that are not quite legible should be re-written distinctly.

(*b*[1]) For rules regarding printing of notes, see rule 315 of the official Manual.

(*c*) The number of copies and the details of distribution should be filled in by the Superintendent or Referencer concerned.

(*d*) In the absence of special instructions to the Press to keep matter standing for a specified period, ordinary papers of 8 pages and under will be kept standing for *one* week, and larger papers for *two* weeks only. *The type of notes and of all confidential papers is distributed immediately after striking.*

(*e*) This slip, properly and completely filled in, should accompany every paper sent to Press; it will be returned by the Press when proofs are furnished; it should be sent to the Press when a call is made for revised proofs or when a corrected proof is sent for striking. When finally returned by Press it should be filed with the original order or letter.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PRESS.

(*a*) If, in the opinion of the Superintendent of the Press, a paper has been marked urgent unnecessarily, he should send the Press slip to the Registrar with a remark to that effect.

(*b*) Unless a note to the contrary is made against the matter, pencil entries should not be printed. The Superintendent of the Press may bring to the notice of the Registrar any instance of incomplete or careless editing.

(*c*) Signature copies of letters to the Secretary of State or to the Government of India should be printed on hand-made paper.

(*d*) This slip should be returned by the Press to the Secretariat when proofs are furnished; it will be sent back to the Press when proofs are returned corrected and should be finally returned to the Secretariat when struck-off copies are supplied.

C. REILLY,
Registrar,
Chief Secretariat.

‡ *To be initialled and dated.*

[P.T.O.

A	B	C
Please send proof in triplicate. The papers have been carefully edited.	Proof returned corrected. Please strike off and send number of copies as indicated. Type may be released after usual interval. / at once.	As the matter is in clear manuscript and has been carefully edited, (*b*) proof need not be sent. Please print and supply number of copies as indicated. Type may be released after usual interval.
.... *Referencer.*	.... *Referencer.*	.... *Referencer.*
.... *Supdt.*	.... *Supdt.*	.... *Supdt.*

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS.

TO BE FILLED IN BY THE PRESS.

Diary.	Initials of Press official.
Received in Press on.........	....
First proof furnished on.........	....
Call for revised proof received on.........	....
Revised proof furnished on.........	....
Corrected proof received for striking on.........	....
Final copies supplied on.........	....

Account of copies.	Complete copies.	Notes.	Issue copies.	Special E.T. edition.
Supplied to Secretariat for Record.........	....	....	....	....
" " " Issue.........	....	....	....	....
" " " Extra E.T. copies to supply requisitions for sale to the public.	....	....	....	 4
For Volumes.........	....	....	....	....
For supply to newspapers and institutions admitted to the privileges of the E.T.	....	....	....	....
Total ...				

Enclosures

Spare copies

36, 14th August 1912.

Sedition.

ures to be taken for the detection and suppression of
avancore State.

[G./2]

5,000—15-9-11.

NOTES.

THE RESIDENCY
TRAVANCORE & COCHIN

Strictly Confidential.

Not seen by H.S.

Inv
5/8/11

Judl. dept.
Previous papers at once please
H.
5/8

CHIEF SECRETARY
5 AUG 1911
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Camp Courtallum
August 3rd 1911.

Fortnightly report for 2nd half of July 1911
(taken as ... by Ch. Pol. Sec.)

My dear Sir Harold,

With my "strictly confidl." d.o dated 31st July I sent you copy of a letter I had despatched from Quilon, addressed to the Durbar protesting against the conduct of Mahadeva Aiyar, Dt. Mgte of Quilon, now on leave, who had so brow beaten a witness who was alleged to have been ready to give useful information that the man fainted in Court.

My letter to the Durbar is dated 30th July and was based on a statement made by Sub Inspr. Kannan of the C.I.D. to the Dt. Mgte, Tinnevelly. On the afternoon of the 31st I saw Inspr. Stevenage of the Travancore Police who was present in the verandah of the Chuttiam while the witness (Subramaniyam) was being questioned by Mahadeva Iyer. Stevenage said that when Subramaniyam found he was going to be taken before the Dt. Mgte he had already begun to waver & to pretend ignorance. When I asked him if he heard what went on inside, he said No. I asked him if he heard any words of abuse such as are attributed by the C.I.D. Sub Inspr. to Mahadeva Aiyar & he again said No and added he thinks he wd. have heard them if they had been used. Shortly afterwards, he says, Subramaniyam came out supported between two men and sat down in the verandah in an exhausted condition. He said

Subramaniyem was an obstinate man and several officials had been at him for some time but without success. I was not satisfied with Stevenage's version as he was palpably eager to minimise the fainting incident and to support his superiors in every way. I have since learnt that he wants to get a post as Market Inspr. on his retirement wh. will be in a few days. He is very dependent therefore on the good word of his superior officers. As I had not recd. George's report about the incident wh. I had asked for, I wired to George to come in & see me at Quilon on 1st August. His ~~letter~~ report had gone on to Trivm. & back again & I recd. it only on the 2nd Aug. He came in and told me that in this instance he does not for a moment believe that Mahadeva Aiyer tried to prevent Subramaniyem from speaking: on the other hand, Mahadeva Iyer came to him & told him that Subramaniyem was obstinate & when he spoke harshly to him he had fallen down in a faint. George says that there was never any suggestion that Mahadeva Aiyer had prevented the man making a statement: which he was willing to make; on the contrary, it was well known that Subramaniyem could say a good deal if he liked but that all the efforts of the officials to make him speak had so far been unavailing although they had repeatedly assured him that he wd. not be made an accused. He thinks that Subramaniyem being pressed by his official superior – the chief official of the District – fainted through fright.

I place these fresh facts before you to know in what way Government consider they may be taken to affect the situation. I have pressed the Durbar to make a thorough enquiry into Mahadeva Aiyer's conduct ~~[illegible]~~

358

3

THE RESIDENCY
TRAVANCORE & COCHIN

in this matter. Shall it be left at that or, as I suggest, shall I write to the Durbar saying that as it is known Mahadeva Aiyer is ill, the explanation which the Durbar will doubtless call for need not be sent till his leave expires(x) and pending its consideration I ask that he may be sent to another division.

(x) Note
He had 40 days leave from 10th July
A.F.

Mahadeva Aiyer's previous conduct certainly raises a strong suspicion against him. On the other hand the C.I.D Sub Inspr's statement is silent as to what passed between Mahadeva Aiyer & Subramaniyan. He says he heard the Dt. Magte utter the words "bastard son of an ass" & two minutes later Subramaniyan was carried senseless into the verandah while Mahadeva Aiyer went off to see George. Stevenage, neither a very intelligent nor a very reliable witness, says he was at the door & heard no such words. But supposing some abusive words were used, is it more probable they were used to make an unwilling witness speak or to shut the mouth of a man ready to speak? Judging by probabilities, it seems unlikely that a Brahman wd. act in that open & clumsy manner if he wished to impose silence on a willing witness. And it is only the Sub Inspr. who represents ~~him~~ Subramaniyan in that light whereas we know

458

4

from George that Subramaniyen was not a willing witness & ~~the latter~~ he had obt^d permission to bring him to Shencottah to see if he c^d be induced to speak when taken away from his own surroundings.

That the man was questioned – and harshly too according even to Mahadeva Aiyer's own admission to George – and that he fainted seem fairly well established: the question is whether Sub Inspr. Kannan has presented a true or a twisted view of the incident.

Yrs. sincerely,

G. Forbes.

[G/12]

4,000—6-3-11. *From* ....

.... DEPARTMENT.

SUBJECT :—

Regd. 7. 8. 11

CURRENT No. 4047 JUDICIAL

THE RESIDENCY TRAVANCORE & COCHIN

Camp - Courtallum,

Confidential

4" August 1911.

Put up with papers circulated yesterday. 7/8

My dear Sir Harold,

With reference to my strictly confidential letter of the 3rd. current, I enclose copies of a letter with enclosures which I received last night from the Ag. Diwan and of my reply thereto. I request I may be informed by wire whether the preliminary enquiry may be deferred for another 3 weeks until Mr. Mahadeva Iyer has sufficiently recovered to take part in it. He has had blood poisoning accompanied by profuse bleeding from the gums and discolouration in patches all over the body.

CHIEF SECRETARY 7 AUG. 1911 GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Yours sincerely,

A. Forbes.

The Hon'ble Sir Harold Stuart,

K. C. V. O, C.S.I., I.C.S.,

Chief Secretary to Government,

O o t a c a m u n d.

CONFIDENTIAL.

D.O.dated 2nd. August 1911 from the Ag. Diwan of Travancore to the Resident in Travancore and Cochin:-----

With reference to your strictly confidential note of the 30" ultimo, I beg to inform you that action will have to be taken against Mr. Mahadeva Aiyer under the Rules regulating enquiries into the conduct of Public servants passed by His Highness the Maharajah under date the 12" December 1896, published in page 284 of the -- Travancore English Almanac for 1898. A preliminary enquiry will have to be held in the first instance and in that enquiry a statement may also have to be taken from Mr. Mahadeva Aiyer. If from the preliminary enquiry it appears that there are sufficient grounds for holding a formal and public enquiry, a report will have to be submitted to His Highness and a Commission appointed by His Highness to hold the enquiry. On my way back from Shencottah I paid a visit to Mr. Mahadeva Aiyer but found him so weak and poorly that I did not think it advisable even to ask him to extend his leave. I was afraid that my advice might give rise to surmises and conjectures and interfere with his convalescence. I therefore thought it proper to write and ask Dr. Letchmanen, who has been treating Mr. Mahadeva Aiyer about his state of health and copies of my note as well as of his reply I enclose for your information. Though reluctant to put off the enquiry asked for by you I fear that the starting of the enquiry now may prove dangerous to Mr. Mahadeva Aiyer's -- health in his present condition. Mr. Mahadeva Aiyer will be in fit condition according to Dr. Letchmanen in about 3 weeks' time. May I therefore request you to kindly let me know whether under the circumstances, the preliminary enquiry may not be deferred for 3 weeks. Mr. Mahadeva Aiyer's leave expires by the 19"instant.

-----------oOo-----------

Strictly confidential D.O. dated 1st. August 1911 from the

958 7/15

Ag Diwan of Travancore to Dr. Peter N. Lakshmanan:---

Kindly let me know what Mr. Mahadeva Iyer's present state of health is, and favour me with your opinion as to whether he is just now in a fit condition to take part in any official enquiry or submit any official explanation, without endangering his health and if not when he will be in a fit condition for the purpose.

---------------X---------------

D.O. dated 1st August 1911 from Dr. Peter N. Lakshmanan to the Ag. Diwan of Travancore:-----

Mr. Mahadeva Iyer has practically recovered from the illness he was suffering from recently but is still in a convalescent state and weak.

I have strictly enjoined him to take ~~complete~~ complete rest and continue appropriate treatment and diet and if he could manage it, to go out for a change as well to enable him to recover his strength.

In the interest of his health I am of opinion that it is best he took part in no official work or inquiry for at least three --- weeks more unless other complications , unforeseen now, followed necessitating a longer absence.

The longer the period of rest and change for him the better.

---------------oOo---------------

D.O. dated 4" August 1911 from the Resident in Travancore and Cochin to the Ag. Diwan of Travancore:---

In reply to your confidential letter of the 2nd.Current, I write to say that I have informed my Government of Mr. Mahadeva Aiyer's state of health and of your suggestion that the preliminary enquiry may be deferred for another 3 weeks, until he is sufficiently recovered to take part in it. Mean-while I agree that enquiry may be postponed for the present.

(True copies)

A. Forbes.

With reference to this letter from Forbes I invite attention to his letter of Augt 3rd, placed below. It seems probable that the charges against Mahadeva Aiyar were not well founded. They were reported by Gillman and I noted at the time that Gillman acted on hearsay and therefore in communicating them to Forbes I said that he was to make strong representations to the Darbar unless he found reason to believe that the charges were unfounded or exaggerated. (The papers are not available at the moment.)

pp 1-4 ante

pp 21-22 of the Notes to G.O. 1206 99 27-7-11 E

I think the Darbar may properly hold an inquiry into Mahadeva Aiyar's conduct, but this ^not be held while he is ill.

H.A. Stuart
6-8

H.M. (Judl.)
H.E. the Governor.

I agree. Forbes can ~~need~~? explain the matter as he explains it to us.

M. Hammick
6. viii

Under H. E's personal instns the ~~following~~ amended telegram shd. issue at once and the D.O. by tomorrow's post. A d.o. received today is referred

p. 15 ante

to in the draft ~~Telegram~~ telegram. That d.o. shd. be added ~~to this file~~

H.

7/8/11

10

Telegram

To Resident in T & C

Your letters of ~~3rd~~ third and fourth. Government have no objection to [the] postponement of inquiry.

H.C.
7/8

Desp'd
8-8-11

D.O.

My dear Forbes,

I have just sent you a telegram saying that the Govt. have no objection to the postpone~~ment~~ment of the inquiry into Mahadeva Ayyar's conduct. I am desired to suggest that in view of the doubt that has arisen regarding the truth of the charge brought against him, it wd. be well to ~~invite~~ take some means of modifying the terms of the repre~~sentation~~sentation made in your d.o. to the Dewan

Desp'd
9.8.11

11

dated 30th July 1911.
You might explain matters
to the Dewan as you have
explained them to the Govt.

Yours sincerely
Hus
7/8

W.S.

The magi file (Ruby) was available only this morning

Submitted to the W.S for perusal.

RWS
11-8-11

+

Seen. The d.o. of the 31st July sh^d be added to the confidential report (kept by GVS?), and a note sh^d be made of the fact for the purposes of this file

SHS S. H. Slater
12/8

Confidential.

THE RESIDENCY
TRAVANCORE & COCHIN

This may please await further report wh. the Resdt promises

13

Trivandrum.

22nd August 1911.

CHIEF SECRETARY
26 AUG 1911
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

CURRENT NO.
4256
JUDICIAL

Regd. 29.8.11

My dear Sir Harold,

I have seen Mr. Rajagopalachari this morng. & recd. from him typed copies of the statemts. made by Subramaniya Iyer & by Nagam Pillai the Tah: Mgte at Punalur at the period to wh. those statemts. relate. The Diwan has also forwarded Mr. Mahadeva Iyer's own version of the incident. He was careful to state that it was not asked for in explanation of an allegation made against Mr. Mahadeva Iyer wh. he was required to meet but for the informatn. of the Diwan regarding an incident which had come to his notice and about which he wanted to get at the facts.

pp 23-32 post

pp 33-36 ante

That Subramaniya Iyer is a scoundrel there can be no doubt: his statement, especially the early part of it, shows that even to the Diwan he was fencing with the questions put to him but, shifty as he is, he makes it clear that what Mahadeva Iyer did was to press him to speak out what he knew.

pp 23-26 post

14

22-32 Nagam Pillai's statemt. is that he was in the verandah and heard Mahadeva Iyer scolding Subramaniya Iyer. He cd. not hear what was said but presently Mahadeva Iyer called him in and said the man was shamming fainting and asked him to lead him out & he did so. At Mahadeva Iyer's direction he took his statement after Subramania Iyer had lain down for a few minutes. The statemt. is a long one and is set out in extenso in Nagam Pillai's evidence.

Mp 27-32 Nagam Pillai says he read out this statemt. to Mahadeva Iyer who then directed him to take down the statemts. of some other persons also. He did so and the next day he took them along with Subramaniya Iyer to Mr. George who examined them in his presence when they—including presumably Subramaniya Iyer—repeated their statemts of the previous day.

Mr. George is at Tinnevelly and the Diwan will question him on his return. Will then send up all the statemts. taken with my final remarks.

The second part of Mahadeva Iyer's letter contains the explanation wh. he was called upon to furnish for not having placed on record or taken action on a report regarding the dissemination of seditious literature.

Yrs sincerely,

A. Forbes.

Confidential.

THE RESIDENCY TRAVANCORE & COCHIN

1558

Regd. 2.9.11

CURRENT NO. 4297 JUDICIAL

Trivandrum

28th July 1911.
(August)

15

CHIEF SECRETARY 1- SEP. 1911 GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Gm 2/9

My dear Sir Harold,

pp 13-14 ante — In my confidl. d.o. of the 22nd I said I wd. forward the statemts. of the witnesses exd. by the Diwan as soon as George, who was then at Tinnevelly, had been questioned.

pp 23-26 — I now forward (a) the statement of Subramaniya Iyer
pp 27-32 — (b) the statemt. of Nagam Pillai, (c) Mahadeva Iyer's letter
pp 33-36 ante — to the Diwan containing his version of the brow-beating
pp 19-22 — incident, (d) & (e) George's letters to the Diwan, after looking up his notes, on the subject of his examinatn. of Subramaniya Iyer and the date he first heard about the dissemination of seditious pamphlets.

pp 19-22 — The enclosures (d) & (e) were recd. by me only today and as it is a holiday I have not been able to get copies made. I accordingly forward the copies sent by the Diwan and request that when you have done with them you will return them to me to complete my file.

From George's letter (d) it will be seen that he saw Subramaniya Iyer on 2nd July and with difficulty extracted a limited amount of informatn. from him and noted against him "an absolute villain in my opinion" and that on the morng. of the 4th he again saw him when he was brought by Nagam Pillai and he then made a much more detailed statemt. George's letter

thus corroborates Nagam Pillai's statement. At the same time it shows that Subramania Iyer was a reluctant witness & that he was still untruthful when he was questioned by the Divan for on this latter occasion Subramaniya Iyer had the effrontery to say that when he had been exd. by the Suptdt. on the day previous to the date of the alleged brow-beating he had told Mr. George "all the facts wh. I subsequently related to Mr. Nagam Pillai".

George's letter also makes it clear that Mahadeva Iyer himself told him of the "fainting" incident either on the same day or the next & he attached no significance to it.

I have no doubt, therefore, that so far as this charge – or rather allegation – is concerned, Mr. Mahadeva Iyer must be exonerated of any intention or attempt to shut the mouth of a witness willing to give informatn.

As regards the other matter, viz disseminatn. of seditious pamphlets, it is impossible to acquit Mr. Mahadeva Iyer of great carelessness – to say the least – in keeping back the report. From paragraph (4) of his letter it wd. appear that he is sheltering himself behind the plea that Police Inspr. Kumara Pillai was present when he got the report and "as "he seemed to know what was going on" and was also going to see Mr. George he thought he wd. give him full informatn. But the Inspr.

Ap. 33-37 part

1798 17

THE RESIDENCY
TRAVANCORE & COCHIN

(3)

apparently did not know and it is certain that Mr.
George only heard of it several days later. Moreover,
that report contained much information about various
other important matters wh. sh^d have been imparted
as early as possible to Mr. George. However, the
Divan is enquiring further into this matter and as it
is not directly connected with the Subramaniya Iyer
incident which evoked my letter to the Durbar asking for
an enquiry, I think the two subjects may be kept
separate.

If Governmt. is satisfied with the evidence now
forwarded regarding the Subramaniya Iyer incident,
I suggest that I sh^d intimate to the Durbar in a
Confid^l letter that I have reported to my Government
that the statemts. taken show that the interpretat
placed on Mr. Mahadeva Iyer's conduct was a
mistaken one and that Gov^t accept his version
of the incident.

Yrs sincerely,

A. Forbes.

NOTES. 18

C 23
7.9.11
11.9.11

W.S

Submitted for orders, with reference to the C.S.'s note on the D.O dated the 22nd August.

Sm
4/9

p. 13 ante.

CS

Mr. Forbes may take the action suggested at the end of his letter. There is not any evidence of value that Mr. Mahadeva Iyer tried to bully Subramania Iyer into holding his tongue. The C.I.D. sub-inspector jumped to that conclusion because Subramania Iyer evidently did not tell all he knew. It is to be hoped he will be dismissed.

2. Mr. Forbes may be asked to ascertain what steps the Darbar is taking to prevent and detect seditious plots in Travancore. We can't say much about the past for our own arrangements were seriously defective.

Hus
6.9.11

Hon. Sir Murray Hammick

H.E. the Governor

I concur entirely with all [illegible]
8.9.11

Tague [illegible]
8.9.11

10.9.11

10.9.11

8.9.11

CHIEF SECRETARY
11 SEP 1911
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

12/9

19B

WS

Draft D.O. to Mr. Fraser submitted

20/
12.9.11

Sd
12/9

CS

Issue

12/9

20

2098

Judicial department

[C.4297]

D.O / Rf   4047-1, 14.9.11

My dear Forbes,

With reference to your D.O dated the 28th July 1911 I am desired to inform you that after perusing the papers the Govt are satisfied that ~~the charge of brow-beating a witness brought against Mahadeva Iyer was made without foundation and that~~ you may accordingly take the action suggested at the end of your letter.

p 15 notes ante file

the interpretation put upon Mahadeva Iyer's conduct was mistaken

2. I am at the same time to ask you to ascertain and report to Government what steps the Darbar is taking to prevent and detect seditious plots in Travancore.

Despd
14.9.11

To

A.T. Forbes Esquire
Resident in T&C

DO with enclosures (of 1937) of the notes (?)

DWJ 12.9.11

(?) 12/9

(?) 12.9.11

G.
4,000—6-3-11.

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

21

A. T. Forbes Esquire

SUBJECT :—

Confl No. 277 d/14-11-11

21

No.50--1.
Confidential.

THE RESIDENCY TRAVANCORE & COCHIN

CURRENT 5158 JUDICIAL

UNDER SECRETARY 14 NOV 11 PUBLIC ETC. DEPT.

CHIEF SECRETARY 14 NOV 1911 GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Regd 14-11-11

Trivandrum,

11th November 1911.

My dear Sir Harold,

p 20 ante

With reference to your confidetial D.O. No.4047 dated 14th September 1911, I write to inform you that the Darbar fully realises the serious gravity of the matter and states that effective action will soon be taken to prevent a recurrence of the incidents referred to. The Darbar, however, feels that it would be well to await the disposal of the cases pending before the Madras High Court, sothat it may deal with the situation in the light of the evidence adduced and the findings thereon of the Madras High Court. The Darbar enquires whether there is any objection to a little delay in the matter. In the meantime the Darbar has asked Mr.George, the Superintendent of Police, to submit a full report on the incidents in Travancore so far as they have come within his knowledge during his investigation. This is necessary in the opinion

US

Submitted for orders as to the reply

C.S.

[illegible]
15-11-11

Mr Forbes' proposal at the end of his letter may be app. Mr Napier told me the other day that the case in the High Court would probably go on until after the Xmas holidays.

[illegible] 16/11

C.S. [illegible]

of the Darbar, as all the evidence obtained by Mr.George does not appear to have been put in before the Indian courts. A special reporter has also been engaged to take down the whole evidence given in the High Court which is being printed. The Darbar has promised to send me a copy of the printed evidence soon after the case is over. I think that in the circumstances the Darbar's request that it may defer setting out detailed proposals till the evidence is before it in convenient form is reasonable and may be approved.

Yours sincerely,

A. Forbes.

The Hon'ble Sir Harold Stuart,

K.C.V.O., C.S.I., I.C.S.,

Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras,

M A D R A S.

NOTES.

D.O. 4047-2
18/11/11

(Confidential) [C.20515 8]

p 21 ante

U.S.

Draft D.O. to Mr. Forbes submitted.

My dear Forbes,

With reference to your D.O. No 50-1 (Confidential) dated the 11th instant, I am desired to inform you that the Govt have no objection to the Darbar deferring action as proposed.

Yours sincerely

Issue
C.O.S.
18/11

Desptd 19/11/11

Copies Ck
18-11-11

X'd
C.O. 18/11/11

U.S.
18-11-11

CONFIDENTIAL

No.50/11.

THE RESIDENCY TRAVANCORE & COCHIN

Camp - Mattupatti P

24" May 1912.

CHIEF SECRETARY 29 MAY 1912 GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

CURRENT NO. 1782 JUDICIAL

Regd 30-5-12

My dear Cardew,

I enclose a copy of a letter I have received from the Diwan of Travancore on the subject of the measures to be taken to detect and prevent seditious conspiracies in future.

2. The Diwan first asks that there shall be a more full and free communication between the British and Travancore Police in future than there has been in the past in regard to the movements of suspicious persons and to the existence of seditious movements likely to spread from British territory into Travancore. I believe it has not been customary in the past for the C.I.D. to communicate with the Superintendent of Police in Travancore; but under present circumstances there seems no reason why this should not be done.

3. He goes on to suggest that special enquiries should be undertaken from time to time by members of the Police force (apparently) deputed for the purpose, as to the feeling of the public in political matters, especially how they feel towards the British Government; to promise that a careful watch shall be kept on the accused acquitted in the recent conspiracy trial, and also on the convicted accused after their release from imprisonment; to state that if any officer can be singled out for special commendation in connection with the enquiries made after the murder of Mr. Ashe, such officer will be suitably rewarded, so that all officers in the service of the Darbar may know what importance is attached to effective action on such occasions; and finally to ask for any further advice which Government may wish to give.

4. As you know, these are more or less the suggestions which I made to the Diwan. I did not mean however that some particular officer who had done good work should be given some specific reward; but rather that those who had been found to have helped materially in the unravelling of the conspiracy should all be regarded with some special favour; and I have communicated to the ...

the Government's opinion that the Darbar might also make it plain that those who are known to have been apathetic in the matter or have shown any sympathy with criminal conspiracies or conspirators must expect no official favour or advancement. I think also it should be impressed on all officials that it is their duty to ~~regard~~ report at once the existence of any societies of a seditious or objectionable tendency or the importation or propagation of obnoxious literature, and that serious notice should be taken of any failure in this respect. The scope of the proposed periodical enquiries should also be enlarged to cover these -- matters; and particular care will have to be taken in the selection of the persons entrusted with those enquiries. The Travancore Police is not noted either for capacity or for energy and Mr. George has considerable difficulty, I believe, in ordinary enquiries, which will be enhanced in respect of enquiries into the actions and tendencies of persons in higher social positions than common criminals. The enquiries and the selection should, as far as possible, be left in his hands or should at least be made in consultation with him in order that there may be no interference with his authority over his subordinates. Beyond this, I have no suggestions to make.

Yours sincerely,

L A Graham

A. G. Cardew Esquire, I.C.S.C.I.E.,

Chief Secretary to Government,

O o t a c a m u n d.

THE RESIDENCY TRAVANCORE & COCHIN

Copy of D.O. dated 25" April 1912 from the Diwan of Travancore to the Resident in Travancore and Cochin:----

I write to reply to Mr. Forbes' D.O. to me dated 17" September 1911, enquiring, with reference to the facts disclosed during the investigation into the murder of Mr. Ashe, what action the Darbar had taken or proposed to take for the detection of -- seditious plots in the State. As already stated by me in my -- letter to Mr. Forbes, dated 1st. November 1911, the Darbar fully realises the importance of the matter and is prepared to take such action as would prevent a recurrence of the incidents brought to light.

2. The Darbar has now had the opportunity of perusing the judgments of the Madras High Court in Special Bench Case No.1 of 1911. Of the 14 accused charged in that case, Nos.6,7,8,9,10, 11,12 and 14 belong to Travancore; and of these all except Nos. 8 and 9 are natives of Shencottah. No.8 belongs to Punalur and so also No.9. All the Travancore accused (along with the other accused) have been acquitted of the abetment, by conspiracy, of Mr. Ashe's murder, but four of the Travancore accused, namely, Nos.6,7,8 and 14 have been convicted of conspiracy within Section 121A of the Penal Code. The Special Bench find that the conspiracy had its inception early in April 1910, with the advent of the 1" accused Nilakanta at Tenkasi, where a meeting was held on the 10" April, at which an oath was taken for the purpose of a general rising to drive out the British from the country. Admittedly no Travancoreans were present at this meeting. Later on, Nilakanta visited Cochin, Alleppey and Quilon, but there is no evidence as to how he occupied his time during this visit. The second meeting was held at Tuticorin, about the middle of July, at which meeting

THE RESIDENCY TRAVANCORE & COCHIN

meeting also an oath was taken, as at the first meeting, but here again there were no Travancoreans present. The third meeting was at Punalur, and it was attended by the 6", 7" and 8" accused, but no sedition was talked. Then two meetings were held at -- Shencottah - the fourth and fifth meetings which were attended by the 6", 11" and 14" accused, the assassin Vanchi Aiyar and the deceased Dharmaraja Aiyar, but it does not appear that any oath was taken at these meetings; but the 1" accused Nilakanta harangued the others on the miserable ecconomic condition of India and wound up with the pressing necessity of exterminating the -- English. The sixth meeting was held at Punalur, where oath was taken by, among others, the assassin Vanchi, the deceased Dharmaraja and the 6", 7",8",9" and 14" accused. It also appears from the judgment of the High Court(I am speaking of the judgment of the majority of the judges)that, before the advent of the 1"accuse Nilakanta, there was a secret society at Shencottah, called the Bharatha Mata Association, of which the assassin Vanchi, the -- deceased Dharmaraja and the accused Nos.6,7 and 14 were members; but though the society was clearly of a seditious tendency, its object being to procure, read and discuss papers from Pondicherry, its members as such, did not bring themselves in any way within the reach of the law. The actual murder of Mr. Ashe appears to have been resolved upon at Otapidaram, according to the prosecution 12" witness at the house of one Madasami; the only Travancorean then present was the Assassin Vanchi Aiyar. About April or May 1911, there were two further meetings held at Shencottah, in the houses of the 11" and 12" accused, which were attended by the 6", 7", 8" and 14" accused, the assassin Vanchi and the deceased ---- Dharmaraja Aiyan. At these two meetings, the assassin Vanchi took the lead (Nilakanta not being present) and expatiated upon the

the necessity of developing the resources of the country and driving out the English. The Judges have recorded the opinion that every person who attended and took the blood oath was guilt of joining in a conspiracy punishable under Section 121A of the Penal Code. So far as the evidence let in before the Special Tribunal goes, only one of the three oath meetings was held in Travancore territory, the other two being held in British territory. My object in mentioning this specifically is, not by any means to minimise the seroiusness of the thing so far as Travancore is concerned, but to point out that, if the executive officers of Travancore were out of touch with what was going on, the blame can hardly be laid more upon them than on the executive officers of the adjoining British District. The fact seems to be that no body had any idea, either in the Tinnevelly District or in the Shencottah and Punalur taluks of the Travancore State, that a thing like this was brewing. It is now clear that the murder of Mr. Ashe itself was not contemplated by the conspirators as a body It was the individual act of a member of the organisation who happened to be a Travancorean and whose passion must have been inflamed by the seditious literature he had been reading and by the malign influence exercised over him from Pondicherry and -- Otapidaram.

3. The Chief thing that I would suggest for preventing a recurrence of seditious plots like these, is that there should be (1) full and free exchange of information (in regard to matters like these) between the British and Travancore Police. It does not appear to have been so in the past. In the present case as ---- already stated, the conspiracy began in British territory; it then extended into the two taluks of Travancore adjoining the British District of Tinnevelly; in both these taluks, Shencottah specially, there were men related to the disaffected classes in

28

in British India and sympathising with them. If any intimation or warning had been given to the Travancore Police that a -- criminal movement like this had originated in British territory aaad and was likely to spread into Travancore, of course a rigorous watch would have been kept. As it was, the one thing which the Travancore Executive was not prepared for was that any portion of Travancore territory would be used as a base for seditious action against the B Paramount Power. Also, I would point out that the 1" accused Nilakanta, who is found to have organised the whole thing, was a man of Tanjore District; his last employment was an Editor of a Vernacular paper published at Pondicherry, which was proscribed by the Madras Government in March 1910. This man came to Tenkasi, where he started his organisation; and he later on came into Travancore territory. He spent his time(about five month between Tenkasi, Tuticorin, Courtallum, Shencottah, Punalur and Aleppey. A man like that was presumably being watched by the --- Criminal Investigation Department. If so, I submit that intimation of his having entered Travancore territory should have been conveyed to the Travancore Police. The first thing therefore that I would suggest is that arrangements should be made for greater co-ordination between the British and Travancore Police than is visible in this case. Without such co-ordination, all other precautions that may be taken would be comparatively futile. The Darbar of course recognises the obligation lying on it to watch all suspects coming from British territory, but I submit that this obligation cannot be satisfactorily discharged unless the movement of these suspects from British into Travancore territory is notified systematically to the executive officers of the Darbar.

The paper "Suryodaya" proscribed under section 12 of Act I. 1910 (G.O 4247 dt 18-3-10)

4. Another point which I have considered carefully, is -- whether an organisation corresponding to the British Criminal -- Investigation Department may not be started in Travancore. I feel that the idea is not practical. Travancore is after all not very

very much more in size than an average Madras District; and in population it is not more than, say, two Madras Districts. I hardly think that this area or population would justify the creation of two agencies for Police work, and a normal and a special one. The chances are that there would be a friction between the two agencies and any advantage we may have by having a confidential branch to deal with matters like these will be nullified by the circumstance that the men in the Secret Branch will very soon become known to the people among whom they work. I would therefore deprecate the organisation of a Special or secret branch of the Police. At the same time, after what has taken place, it is necessary to make enquiries from time to time, especially in the border taluks, as to the feeling of the public in political matters, especially how they feel towards the British Government.

(2) This can be done through the existing Police force, by deputing from time to time a special man for the purpose of making a careful enquiry in the matter.

5. The 9",10",11" and 12" accused are the four Travancoreans who have been acquitted by the High Court. These will of course

(3) be watched. And so also the convicted Travancoreans, namely, the 6", 7", 8" and 14" accused, when they return after serving their terms of punishment.

6. In regard to the investigation conducted by the British Police after the incident, I have no hesitation in repeating to you that I have already said to Mr.Forbes, that the officers of Travancore have been doing all that they could to co-operate with the British Police; the circumstance that the trial has ended in the conviction of so many as nine accused, of whom four are Travancoreans, may be taken to be a proof of my statement. Mr George has sent me a report on the whole case, and I gather generally from that report that he and his men did all that was possible by way of co-operating with and helping their brethren over the

the frontier. I am also looking over the file of correspondence to see if xxxxx any of the Darbar officers did particularly good work in this direction; and if I find that any officer could be singled out for special commendation and preferment, I shall see that he is suitably rewarded, so that all officers in the service of the Darbar may know what importance is attached to effective action on occasions like these.

7. In conclusion, I feel that this communication is not as -- precise as I would wish. You may rest assured of the Darbar's anxiety to prevent the occurrence of plots like these and of its readiness to take such steps as may be necessary for the purpose. The difficulty however is to say what exactly could be done -- beyond what of course it is our obvious duty to do. The Darbar will deem it a favour if the Madras Government will give the -- matter their consideration and give the Darbar their advice which, I need hardly assure you, will be gladly acted upon.

(4) (5)

---oOo---

(True copy)

C A Graham

Ag. RESIDENT.

25/3/42

US

pp 23-30 ante The Resident's D.O is submitted for orders

2. The D.O is apparently is intended as

p 20 ante a reply to this Govt's D.O No 4047-1 of 14-9-11 enquiring what action the Darbar proposes to take to detect and prevent seditious plots in Travancore.

3. The measures proposed by the Diwan and accepted by the Resident are:—

(a) Free and full exchange of information between the Travancore Police and the Madras C.I.D

(b) Periodical inquiry by a specially selected police officer to ascertain the state of public feeling generally in political matters and in particular towards the British Government.

(c) ~~special recognition~~ The grant of special rewards to ~~such~~ of the Travancore officials as have rendered Commendable Service in Connection with the Tinnevelly Conspiracy case

3. The Resident ~~appears~~ to have generally approved of these measures and in addition intimated to the Diwan that the Darbar must make it quite plain that those who are known to have been apathetic or have shown sympathy with criminal

All this is quite unnecessary

HWS

32

conspirators should expect no official favour or advancement.

~~He~~ He also proposes that ~~for~~ the duty of promptly reporting the existence of seditious societies or the of dissemination of seditious literature should be impressed upon the Darbar officials, that this subject should be included within the scope of the periodical inquiry referred to above and that the inquiry itself should, if not left in his hands be at least made in consultation with Mr. George the Travancore St of Police.

4. For orders as to whether the views of the I.G. of Police may be invited on these proposal U.O. He will no doubt consult the D.I.G. C.I.D & Reps.

20J
7-6-12

I think the file may be sent U.O to the I.G of Police for his opinion

L. J. P. Jolly
C.S.
7.6.12

23

Please see D.O. C. 89 Pol. 8.1.5.12 flagged D in Stokes-ing file in sealed cover

[illegible]
10/6/12

I had not seen this correspondence before but a D.O. was sent to the Resid^t. about a month ago on the subject of the Darbar's attitude towards loyal + disloyal Gov^t. offl^s. Please put that up. It was issued in Political.

A. G. Cardew
8.6.12

C.S. [initials]
10.6.12

9/11.6.12

I want to know whether the various CID periodical reports are sent (1) to the Resident or PA (2) the Darbar of any native State.

AGL
11.6.12

Judicial Department.

Extract from the C.S.'s Note in connection with C.No.4047 of 1911.

x x x x x x x x x x

" I want to know whether the various C.I.D. periodi-
"cal reports are sent (1) to the Resident or P.A.,
"(2) the Darbar of any Native State."

(Inld). A.G.C.

11-6-12.

U.S.

The D.I.G., C.I.D. and Railways may be requested u.o. to kindly furnish the particulars wanted by the C.S. as they are not easily traceable in the Office and as the Superintendent, Govt. Press knows only about the distribution of confidential Newspaper Reports.

[initials] 17-6-12

Send u.o. to D.I.G. [initials] 18.6.12

CURRENT NO. 1934 JUDICIAL

Jud! no. 1934 / 18.6.12

87

35P

35

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL.

No 426-C
21. 6. 12.

CHIEF SECRETARY
22 JUN 1912
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Confl. Ct. No 101 Judl.
d/24/6/12

The S.B. publish 1 & 2: the C.I.D. 3.

1. Secret Abstract
2. Weekly Newspaper Report
3. Criminal Intelligence Gazette.

2. The Secret Abstract is sent to

1. Resident in Hyderabad
2. Resident in Mysore
3. Resident in Travancore & Cochin
4. I.G. of Police, Ceylon.

It is not sent to any Durbars.

3. The Weekly Newspaper Report is sent to

1. Resident in Mysore
2. Asst. to the Agent to the Governor General in Rajputana.
3. do. in Central India
4. Resident in Hyderabad
5. Resident in Travancore & Cochin
6. Resident in Nepal.

It is not sent to any Durbars.

4. The Criminal Intelligence Gazette is distributed to Residents, Agents and Durbars as shown in the accompanying two lists.

C M Longden
21. 6. XII

LIST OF RESIDENTS OR POLITICAL AGENTS TO WHOM COPIES OF THE MADRAS CRIMINAL INTELLIGENCE GAZETTE PUBLISHED BY THE C.I.D., MADRAS, ARE SENT.

Serial No.	Designation of the Officer.	Station.
	LIST OF RESIDENTS.	
1	The Resident in Mysore	Bangalore.
2	The Resident in Travancore	Trivandrum
3	The District Magistrate, Mercara.	Coorg.
	LIST OF POLITICAL AGENTS.	
1	The Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General of India, Central India Agency.	Indore.
2	His Majesty's Consul at Pondicherry.	Pondicherry.
3	The Superintendent-General of Police, Mount Abu.	Rajputana.

5718P

LIST OF DURBARS TO WHOM COPIES OF THE MADRAS CRIMINAL INTELLIGENCE GAZETTE PUBLISHED BY THE C.I.D., MADRAS, ARE SENT.

Serial No.	Designation of the officer.		Name of the State.
1.	Inspector-General of Police, Gwalior, Central India.		Gwalior.
2.	Do.	Indore	Indore
3.	Do.	Marwar	Marwar
4.	Do.	Jind.	Phulkian States & Bhawalpur.
5.	The City Magistrate		Jaipur.
6.	The Superintendent of Gerai		Jaipur.
7.	The Commissioner of Police, Baroda		Baroda.
8.	The Superintendent of Police		Ajmere.
9.	Do.	Travancore	Travancore.
10.	Do.	Jalandur Dn.	Maler-Katla.
11.	Do.	Lahore Dn.	Chamba.
12.	Do.		Bhawalpur.
13.	Do.		Bundi.
14.	The Supt. of Police & Gerai.		Kishengar (Rajputana)
15.	The Supt.-Genl. of State Police, Bikaneer, Rajputana.		Bikaneer.
16.	The Supt. of State Police.		Bharatpur.
17.	The Asst. Supt. of Police, Delhi Dn., (Nahan State)		Sirmur.
18.	The Kotwal in charge of Tonk Police Force, Rajputana.		Tonk.
19.	The Inspector-General of Police, Mysore.		Mysore.
20.	The Pudukkotta Durbar.		Pudukkottah.
21.	The Mahakamaikas Chief Council, Mewar, Rajputana.		Mewar.
22.	The Inspector-General of Police, Jalandur Dn.		Kapurthala.
23.	The Inspr.-Genl. of Police & Jails.		Hyderabad (Deccan).
24.	The Asst. Inspr.-Genl., C.I.D.		Do.

Serial No.	Designation of the Officer.	Name of the State.
25.	The Dy. Inspr.-Genl.of Police in charge of H.H. the Nizam's State Railway Police	Secunderabad(Hyderabad State)
26.	The Inspr. of Police, Jalandur Dn.	Faridkote.
27.	The Supt. of Police	Cochin State.
28.	Do.	Alwar.
29.	The Diwan	Kotah.
30.	Do.	Jhalwar.
31.	Do.	Sakti (Central Provinces)
32.	The Feudatory Chief	Kankar (Central Provinces)
33.	Do.	Khariagarh (Do.)
34.	Do.	Raigarh (Do.)
35.	Do.	Patna, Bolangir (Do.)
36.	Do.	Bamra (Do.)
37.	Do.	Rampur, Rehrakhol(Do.)
38.	Do.	Makrai, (Do.)
39.	The Maharaja & Feudatory Chief	Sonpur Feudatory State.
40.	The Superintendent	Bastar, Jagadalpur.
41.	Do.	Nandgaon State.
42.	Do.	Chhuikhadan (Central Provinces).
43.	Do.	Kawardha.
44.	Do.	Sarangarh.
45.	Do.	Kalahandi.
46.	The Supt. of Police	Shapura (Rajputana)
47.	The Mekhmakas	Dungarpur (Do.)
48.	Do.	Partabgar (Do.)
49.		Banswara (Do.)

No. C. 21

Circd 27.6.1912

Retd 2-7-1912

NOTES.

Page 39

US

With reference to the C.S.'s query on p 33 ante

pp 35-37 ante

the C.I.D note is submitted for perusal.

217
25-6-12

CS.

25.6.12

HM

H.E. the Govr

Please see Notes on p. 18 to which the Resident's Letter d 24 May 1912 on p. 23 relates.

2. The most important suggestion made by the Diwan of Travancore is that there should be "full & free exchange of

p27 information between the British & Travancore police", & that arrangements should be

p28 made for "greater co-ordination" between the two than has hitherto been the case.

p35 It appears from the C.I.D. report d. 21.6.12 that the Secret Abstract is sent to the Resident in Travancore & Cochin, but not to the Darbar. It is ~~probably~~ I think undesirable to send it to the Darbar. But I think that it might be sent demi officially to the Travancore Supt. of Police direct, as a personal matter & so long as Mr George is there, for perusal & return. ~~...~~ communication of the

not become a regular routine & should be done each week under the orders of the D.I.G. The IG might be asked whether he can suggest any further measures of coordination between the British & State Police.

3. The Diwan's 2nd suggestion that an officer might be deputed from time to time to make special enquiries ~~[illegible]~~ "as to "the feeling of the public in political matters" may be approved, though the proposed object of enquiry does not seem likely to be very fruitful of results.

4. Mr Graham's suggestion that it should be impressed upon all officials that it is their duty to report the existence of seditious societies or literature should, I think, also be given effect to.

[signature] 26.6.12

Read for circu on 27.6.12 at 6.30 p.m.

I agree that Mr George should be kept informed of all political matters that do or may concern Travancore but it would be better to send him special notes of such information rather than to send him a copy of the Abstract which contai

a good deal of information that in no way concerns Travancore. If we once begin sending the whole abstract to the Travancore Supt. it will be difficult to stop it.

Jaques [initials] 29.vi.12

2. I do not approve of the Dewan's proposal to make periodical inquiries regarding the political feeling in the district of Travancore which border on British India. Such inquiries are not likely to do much good and may do a great deal of harm. The special officer would be unable to keep his inquiries secret and he might arouse the very feeling which we hope will disappear. Moreover there would be a tendency on his part to prove his zeal by collecting a lot of information of very doubtful value. What is wanted is a continuous alertness on the subject and the superior officers of the Travancore police as suggested by Mr. Graham and approved in para 4 of the Chief Secy's note.

Jaques [initials] 29.vi

3. The C.I.D. may be asked whether they wish to bring to notice any services of

Jaques [initials] 29.vi.12

value rendered by the Travancore police.

H.A.S.
28/6

I agree to the above. I suppose the Resident in Travancore sees the Travancore I.G. of Police from time to time & he could by word of mouth give him any intelligence he gets from the C.I.D. reports. It would not of course do for the Resid^t^ to be in regular communication with the I.G. but a good Resident could always manage to let the I.G. know anything of importance.

I don't think the I.G. Travancore sh^d^ get the C.I.D abstracts – but the I.G. Madras could always arrange to let him know of anything of interest & importance which related to Travancore.

W.
29. VI. 12

CHIEF SECRETARY'S ... GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
2 JUL 1912

I doubt whether the ~~proposals~~ opinions of Gov^t^ should be formulated in a G.O.; it will I think suffice to communicate them to the Resident by D.O.

C.S.
4.7.12

Yes – the D.O. form should certainly be used A.G.
4.7.12

US

A draft D.O. to the Resident is submitted for approval. It is presumed that there will be a formal official communication from the Resident later on, regarding the measures to be adopted. In any case it seems necessary after the issue of the D.O. to send the file with D.O. to the I.G. of Police in order that he may know what is expected of him and that he may furnish the information called for by the H.M. in para 3 of his note on pp 41-42 ante.

Fraaders.

20/
10-7-12

CS

[illegible]
10.7.12

Issue D.O. & put up a D.O. to I.G. of Police sending him copy of the correspondence.

pp 20 (para. 2) pp 23.30 ~~& the reply~~

[illegible]
10.7.12

Judicial department

D.O. No. 1934-I, of 10.7.12.

My dear Graham,

I am desired to acknowledge the receipt of your D.O. No 50/11 (Confl) dated the 26th May 1912 on the subject of the measures to be taken to detect and prevent seditious conspiracy in Travancore. pp 23-24 n.f.

2. I am to say that the proposed measures generally commend themselves to Govt. ~~B~~ They ~~cannot~~ doubt however the expediency of the ~~however, approve of the [illegible]~~ proposal to make periodical enquiries regarding the political feeling in the districts of Travancore which border on British India. Such inquiries ~~were~~ would not be likely to elicit much useful inform while they might do harm. ~~do much good [illegible] might [illegible] could not [illegible] will be [illegible] considerable [illegible] which, the Govt hope, will~~

4598

45 2

~~disappear in course of time.~~ Moreover there would be a tendency on the part of the special officer to prove his zeal by collecting a mass of information of doubtful value. What is wanted is, as suggested by you, a continuous alertness on the part of the generally ~~subordinate and inferior officers of the~~ Travancore Police who should promptly bring to notice the existence of seditious societies or literature.

3. The Govt ~~also~~ agree that Mr. George should be kept informed of all political matters that do or may concern Travancore. They do not ~~however~~ ~~[illegible]~~ consider it necessary to supply him with copies of all the periodical reports issued by the Madras C.I.D., as the bulk of what is contained therein is in no way relevant to ~~concerns~~ Travancore ~~It will be sufficient if during your occasional meetings~~ but the I.G. will be instructed to send him special notes of any inform- that is likely to be of value & you, when you see him, can doubtless keep him informed of anything of importance.

AGl 10-7-12

4610

46

the Travancore I.G. of Police, you communicate to him by word of mouth any relevant intelligence you may find in the C.I.D reports. The Madras I.G. of Police can also arrange to let him know of anything of interest & importance which relates to Travancore.

Yours sincerely

[illegible]
10.7.12

[illegible]
10.7.12

Desp'd
10.7.12

To

R. A. Graham Esqre
I.C.S
Resident at T & C

us

pp 46-46 back The reply to the Resident having issued a draft D.O to the I.G. of Police is submitted for approval.

WJ
15.7.12

[illegible]
16.7.12

(D.O. No. 1934-2, of 17.7.12)

4886

H

Judicial Department

D-O No. 1934-2, d/ 17.7.12

My dear Cowie,

I am desired to forward to you for information and necessary action copies of the correspondence between the Govt. and the Resident in T & C on the subject of the measures to be taken for the detection and suppression of seditious conspiracy and literature in the Travancore State.

[2. In this connection, I am to enquire whether in consultation with Mr. Langden you wish to bring to the notice of Govt any services of value recently rendered by the Travancore Police.]

Yours sincerely

G
16.7.12

(CS to sign)

para 3 of HMB notes pp 46 to 62
2. f

Despd
17.7.12

To the Hon: Mr.

O. W. G. Cowie ~~Esquire~~ I.C.S

I.G. of Police D.O. with copies of para 2 of DO of 14-9-11 and of pp 23-30 & pp 44-46 n-f.

MB
15.7.12

Sedition.
Recording papers 49 P re the measures to be taken for the detection of seditious [illegible] literature in the [illegible]

For the U. S.

The notes relating to the recognition by Govt. of the service rendered by Travancore Officials in the investigation of the Tinnevelly Conspiracy Case have been extracted and added to the file on that subject. A draft order recording these notes is submitted for approval.
(Perhaps the order may be printed)

W. O. F.
13. 8. 12

S. D.
13. 8. 12.

Yes
Sur
14/8

Issue
Sur
14/8

(G. O. No. 1286, Judl., of 14. 8. 12)

Sedition.

Recording papers regarding the measures to be taken for the detection & suppression of seditious conspiracy and literature in the Travancore state.

[9 / 6]

7,000—8-3-12.

READ

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

P. N

ORDER No 1286, dated 14 8 1912.

~~Mis~~ (P.S.)	Recorded.
W.P. 13.8.12	SM 14/8
S.D. 13.8.12.	

[G./2]

5,000—8-8-12.

NOTES.

Papers put up

1) Current No 105. (Confl) dt 25.6.1912.

2) {Madras Police Abstract of Intelligence, Vol. 25, No. 31 dt 10.8.1912}

3) G.O. No 1286 (Confl) dated 14.8.1912

20 Confl. 1912

Chief Office of the
Inspector-General of Police,

Madras, 14th August 1912

CHIEF SECRETARY GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS 16 AUG 1912

CURRENT NO. 3710 JUDICIAL-A

Regd 16-8-12

My dear Cardew,

With reference to para 3 of D.O. 1934-1 dated 10th July 1912, from yourself to the Ag Resident in Travancore & Cochin and also your D.O. 1934-2 dated 17-7-12, to me, I have to state that in consultation with Longden, I propose to make the following arrangements with a view to assisting George with information that may be valuable to him in detecting and preventing seditious plots in Travancore.

(1) Information on matters concerning Travancore will be sent to George by the C.I.D. through the I.G.

(2) Information of the movements of "starred" suspects and any other temporary important suspect to Travancore, will be sent to George direct and copies to Government by the C.I.D.

2. I think that the Resident in Travancore and Cochin should also be instructed to see that the Superintendents of Police, in these States, keep themselves informed of:-

(1) Political movements

P.T.O.

2,000--8-3-12.

From *I. G. Police.* *Judicial* DEPARTMENT.

1-2

SUBJECT :— *Detection and prevention of Seditious plots in Travancore*

2

(2) Religious and Social Movements

(3) Formations of Political and Social Associations.

(4) The Circulation of seditious literature.

and that Longden should also be kept informed, if necessary, on these matters through the Resident.

3/ I also think and agree with Longden that some arrangement should be made between the British and State Police forces for systematic surveillance of such suspects as may be handed over to the latter by us.

4/ I do not anticipate that the Durbars will object to this necessary and probably very limited amount of secret surveillance work, and if the principle is approved the necessary working details can be settled between Longden and George at a personal interview.

Yours sincerely,

[signature]

The Hon'ble Mr. A.G.Cardew, M.A., C.S.I.,I.C.S.,
Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Ootacamund.

Page 13 of Proof of Notes to G.O. 1286 [illegible]

(x) Secret [illegible]

Secret Po[lice] Abstracts "Q"

C 41
Circd. 28. 8 1912
Retd. 30-8-1912

NOTES. Page —

For U.S.

Submitted for orders.

2. The proposals of the I. G. of Police in his D.O. No 20 Confl d/ 14.8.1912, are, it is submitted, in accordance with the views expressed by Govt.

CSS 24.8.12

DM 26.8

Not quite. Para. 2 goes further and proposes action of somewhat ~~[illegible]~~ the same nature as the special enquiries to which the H.M. objected.

Sur 26/8

CS

HM.

H.E. the Gov.

The I.G. may be told that while the Supt should "keep himself informed ~~of the~~ on the subjects named in para. 2, the Govt deprecate special enquiries on these or similar matters.

AG 27.8.12

HM 29/8

Pages 1 and 2 ante

(Page 12 of proof of ...tes to G.O. 1256 d/14.8.12)

... I think the previous ... might not to have ... recorded. I did not understand that a reply ... be sent by the I.G. ... probably be best to add ... notes to G.O. 1256, but ... take instructions on ... of the file

Sur)

Sur 28/8

CHIEF SECRETARIAT
30 AUG 1912
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Issue
...
30 viii 12

Recd 2/9/12

For U.S.

Draft D.O.s are submitted.

CW.
5/9/12

S.D.
6.9.12

Sm
6/9

(Issued as D.O. No.s 3710-1 dd 7.9.1912 and 3710-2 dd 17.9.1912).

Judicial Dept.

(Ct. 3710 A).

D.O. No. 3710 A-1, d/ 7-9-12

My dear Graham,

I am desired to forward to you, for information, a copy of a D.O. from Cowie, regarding the measures ~~to be taken~~ he proposes to take for the detection and prevention of seditious conspiracies in Travancore. Cowie has been in-formed that Govt. consider that ~~the~~ the Supdt of Police, Travancore, should "Keep himself informed" on the subjects mentioned in para 2 of his letter, but they deprecate special enquiries on these or similar matters.

Despd
7. 9. 12

The Resdt, T. and C.
(with copy of D.O. No 3710 d/ 16.8.12 on pages 1 & 2. Notes File)

Recd from Supdt
24/9/12

CW
5.9.12.

SW
6.9.12.

GM
6/9

...eply to your D.O. No...
...l of the 14th August la...
...ding the measures to be taken
...e detection and prevention of sedit...
plots in Travancore, I am desired t...
inform you that ~~while~~ ~~Govt.~~ white Govt. cons...
that ~~while~~ the Supdts. of Police, in Travan...
(and Cochin) Should * Keep ~~himself~~ themselves informed * of
~~the~~ matters referred to in para 2 thereof,
~~(1) Political Movements (2) Religious and~~
~~Social Movements (3) Formations of~~
~~Political And Social Assns. (4) The~~
~~circulation of seditious literature in the~~
~~State~~, ~~they~~ the Govt. deprecate special enquiries
~~of~~ concerning these or similar matters. They approve
your other proposals.

Despd
7.9.12

The I. G. Police
(D.O. only).

CAS
5.9.12

Sm
6/9

CS.

~~23/02/99/PC/99~~

6/2/09